

VOLUME XLVIII • NUMBER 4

*December 1957*

# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

---

FOUNDED BY PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

A QUARTERLY ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF  
ROMANCE LANGUAGES IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS • PUBLISHER

DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE

# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION

VOLUME XLVIII

DECEMBER 1957

NUMBER 4

JUSTIN O'BRIEN, *General Editor*

JEAN-ALBERT DÉDÉ

BERT M-P. LEEFMANS

DINO BIGONGIARI

LAWTON P. G. PECKHAM

LEROY C. BREUNIG

MARIO A. PEI

ANGEL DEL RÍO

DANIEL F. PENHAM

ENRICO DE' NEGRI

JEANNE VARNEY PLEASANTS

OTIS FELLOWS

MICHAEL RIFFATERRE

DONALD M. FRAME

JAMES F. SHEARER

JEAN HYTIER

NORMAN L. TORREY

JULES BRODY, *Managing Editor*

---

## CONTENTS

### ARTICLES

An Account of the Early Life of the Accademia degli Infiammati in the Letters of Alessandro Piccolomini to Benedetto Varchi

FLORINDO V. CERRETA 249

The Date of Boileau's *Traité du Sublime* JULES BRODY 265

The Function of Irony in Roger Martin du Gard LEON S. ROUDIEZ 275

### REVIEWS

L. Goldmann, *Le Dieu caché: Etude sur la vision tragique dans les Pensées de Pascal et dans le théâtre de Racine* [E. B. O. BORGERHOFF] 287

P. Savey-Casard, *Le Crime et la peine dans l'œuvre de Victor Hugo*, and Victor Hugo, *Claude Gueux*, edited by P. Savey-Casard [PHILIP SPENCER] 290

### REVIEWS IN BRIEF

Margaret M. Pelan, ed., *Floire et Blancheflor* [V. FREDERICK KOENIG] 294

Paul O. Kristeller, *The Classics and Renaissance Thought* [EDWARD WILLIAMSON] 295

Elias L. Rivers, *Francisco de Aldana, el divino capitán* [BRUCE W. WARDROPPER] 297

Saint-Jean de Brébeuf, *Les Relations de ce qui s'est passé aux pays des Hurons (1635-1648)*, ed. by Théodore Besterman [W. E. THORMANN] 299

Rotrou, *Venceslas, tragi-comédie*, ed. by W. Leiner [LEONARD J. WANG] 301

J. D. Hubert, *Essai d'exégèse racinienne* [JOHN C. LAPP] 302

John Lough, <i>Paris Theatre Audiences in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries</i> [ROBERT J. NELSON]	304
Arthur M. Wilson, <i>Diderot: The Testing Years, 1713-1759</i> [NORMAN L. TORREY]	306
Jane Ceitac, <i>Voltaire et l'affaire des Natifs</i> [NORMAN L. TORREY]	307
Hans Wolpe, <i>Raynal et sa machine de guerre</i> [VIRGIL W. TOPAZIO]	308
M.-F. Guyard, <i>Lamartine</i> [ALBERT J. GEORGE]	309
Richard H. Powers, <i>Edgar Quinet: A Study in French Patriotism</i> [OSCAR A. HAAC]	310
Raymond Giraud, <i>The Unheroic Hero in the Novels of Stendhal, Balzac, and Flaubert</i> [MURRY SACHS]	311
Bernard Gicovate, <i>Julio Herrera y Reissig and the Symbolists</i> [A. TORRES-RIOSECO]	312
Rainer Maria Rilke, <i>Lettres milanaises, 1921-1926</i> , ed. by Renée Lang [LISE-LOTTE DIECKMANN]	314
Helmut Hatzfeld, <i>Bibliografía crítica de la nueva estilística aplicada a las literaturas románicas</i> [MICHAEL RIFFATERRE]	315
Heinrich Lausberg, <i>Romanische Sprachwissenschaft. I: Einleitung und Vokalismus; II: Konsonantismus</i> [ROBERT L. POLITZER]	316
Victor Riederer, <i>Der lexikalische Einfluss des Deutschen im Spiegel der französischen Presse zur Zeit des zweiten Weltkrieges</i> [KONRAD BIEBER]	318
Yvette Louriá, <i>La Convergence stylistique chez Proust</i> [VICTOR E. GRAHAM]	319
H. J. W. Van Hoorn, <i>Poésie et mystique: Paul Claudel, poète chrétien</i> [MARTHE LAVALLÉE WILLIAMS]	321
Index	323

THE ROMANIC REVIEW is published four times a year (February-April-October-December) by Columbia University Press, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md. Single copies \$1.25 (foreign \$1.35); \$5.00 a year (foreign, including Canada, \$5.30). Subscribers should notify the publisher of change of address at least three weeks before publication of issue with which change is to take effect. Entered as second-class matter, at the post office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright 1957 by Columbia University Press.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to Professor Justin O'Brien, Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York City. THE REVIEW will not be responsible for the return of manuscripts unless accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. For all questions regarding preparation of manuscripts and printing style, consult the *MLA Style-Sheet* which originally appeared in *PMLA*, LXVI (1951), 3-31, and is available in reprints.

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to Columbia University Press, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md., or 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y.



# AN ACCOUNT OF THE EARLY LIFE OF THE ACCADEMIA DEGLI INFIAMMATI IN THE LETTERS OF ALESSANDRO PICCOLOMINI TO BENEDETTO VARCHI

By Florindo V. Cerreta

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

THE letters appended to this article were written by the Siense humanist Alessandro Piccolomini (1508-79) during the years 1540-41 and are addressed, with the exception of the first, to Benedetto Varchi at Bologna.<sup>1</sup> The manuscripts, originally in the Strozzi collection, were overlooked by Casanova and Rossi, who published several other letters by Piccolomini discovered in the Florentine archives.<sup>2</sup> Written by an officer of the Accademia degli Infiammati of Padua, the letters provide us with first-hand information about the relatively obscure life of the academy itself. Thus they are to be considered a necessary supplement to the letters of Niccolò Franco, Pietro Aretino, Benedetto Varchi, and other contemporary writers, containing references to the literary circle.

Even today, the standard source to which scholars must turn for an account of this academy is the article on the Paduan academies written by Gennari in the eighteenth century.<sup>3</sup> Though quite reliable on the whole, this work has its limitations, for Gennari himself admits he was seriously handicapped by the almost complete lack of original documents pertaining to the Infiammati, having therefore to glean his facts mostly from works containing incidental references to the Paduan circle. On the other hand, Piccolomini's letters were written as progress reports for Varchi who, during his absence from Padua, wished to be kept posted on the activities of the academy of which he had been a very active member. Thus these letters constitute a trustworthy source for a partial reconstruction of the early life of the Infiammati. Though an exhaustive treatment of the Accademia degli Infiammati is beyond the scope of this study, a few prefatory remarks may help in better ascertaining the value of the new documents as well as in illustrating the part played by Piccolomini in the academy.

The Accademia degli Infiammati was the first of the sixteenth-century academies to be founded in Padua.<sup>4</sup> Its birth coincided with the departure

1. These letters, published here for the first time, are all autographs kept in the Biblioteca Nazionale of Florence, "Lettere al Varchi," *Autografi Palatini*, Vol. II, nos. 65-73.

2. Cf. E. Casanova, "Lettere di Alessandro Piccolomini," *Bullettino Senese di Storia Patria*, XIII (1906), 187-219 and M. Rossi, "Le Opere letterarie di Alessandro Piccolomini," *ibid.*, XVII (1910), 289-328; XVIII (1911), 3-53.

3. G. Gennari, "Saggio storico sopra le accademie di Padova," *Saggi Scientifici e Letterari dell'Accademia di Padova* (Padova, 1786), I, 14-23.

4. B. Brunelli, *I Teatri di Padova* (Padova, 1921), p. 38.

for Rome of Pietro Bembo, the ardent champion of the vernacular. This fact is of particular significance in the history of the *questione della lingua* since some of the first members of the *Infiammati* had belonged to the Bembian circle and were the continuators of the theories incorporated in the *Prose*.<sup>5</sup> In accordance with these linguistic doctrines, concerned primarily with the promotion of the vernacular, the *Infiammati* launched an extensive program whose main objective was the translation into Italian of the entire corpus of scientific knowledge still in the original Greek or Latin. This program as well as other literary aims pertaining to the activities of this circle still remain the subject of much debate. In fact, the theory has been advanced that the seeds of Italy's *Secentismo* can be traced back to the interpretations rendered by the *Infiammati* of the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle.<sup>6</sup> Also the presence of numerous Tuscan students both at the University and at the *Accademia* and their relationship later with the *Accademia Fiorentina* posit a question concerning the extent of exchanges between the two centers on linguistic matters.<sup>7</sup>

It is commonly accepted that the academy was founded in 1540 by Leone Orsini, later bishop of Fréjus, Ugolino Martelli, later bishop of Glandève, and Daniello Barbaro. Besides these founding fathers, we find among the earliest promoters Sperone Speroni, Giovanni Cornaro, Galeazzo Gonzaga, Emanuele Grimaldi, Bernardino Tomitano, and Bembo's close associate, Cola Bruno. The Tuscan group comprised Benedetto Varchi, Lorenzo Lenzi, Fabrizio Strozzi, Alberto del Bene, and Alessandro Piccolomini.<sup>8</sup>

The exact date of the founding is not known, but indications are that it occurred during the earlier part of 1540 since Cornaro, who was the first president, started his term in April of that year (Letters 65 and 66).<sup>9</sup> If the birth of the academy is placed in the early months of 1540, the conclusion follows that Orsini, referred to in contemporary documents as *autore e primo principe*, held merely the honorary title of president.<sup>10</sup>

5. V. Cian, *Un Medaglione del Rinascimento: Cola Bruno messinese e le sue relazioni con Pietro Bembo* (Firenze, 1901), p. 63.

6. Cf. G. Toffanin, *Il Cinquecento* (Milano, 1935), pp. 111-12.

7. Cian, p. 61.

8. Gennari, p. 14. Other members included Francesco Sansovino, Marcantonio Mantova, Gianbattista Maganza, Luigi Alamanni. Contrary to Cian's statement (p. 63), Varchi held only a minor office since he includes himself among the "minoringhi" of the academy (*Opere* [Trieste, 1859], II, 161). On this point cf. also G. Manacorda, *B. Varchi: l'uomo, il poeta, il critico* (Pisa, 1903), p. 40.

9. Hereafter references to the Piccolomini letters which appear at the end of this article will be made within the text. The numbers are the same as those given in the Nazionale collection.

10. Speroni refers to Orsini as "primo principe e fondatore" (*Opere* [Venezia, 1740], III, 251). The same title appears in Piccolomini's "privilegio" or membership card of the *Infiammati*, which I cite here in its entirety:

"Noi Leone Orsino eletto di Frégus autore et primo Principe dell'Accademia degli *Infiammati* eletto da M. Alessandro Piccolhuomini Sanese. Perché gli statuti et ordinamenti nostri vogliono che tutti quelli i quali sono dell'Accademia nostra degli *Infiammati*, hab-

Not to accept this would necessitate pushing back the date of founding to 1539 in order to account for Orsini's term, on the assumption that it came before Cornaro's and lasted the usual six months.

Following a custom that became widespread during the sixteenth century, the founders adopted an emblem for their academy, in this case, the legend of Hercules burning on Mount Oeta with the motto "Arso il mortal, al Ciel n'andrà l'eterno."<sup>11</sup> It is not clear whether the name of the academy was derived from the emblem itself or from the fact that Speroni had fired the souls of the *Infiammati* with a burning desire to study philosophy and eloquence in the vernacular.<sup>12</sup>

The election of officers, their terms, duties as well as other academic procedure were regulated by a set of laws called *capitoli* (Letters 66, 68, 73). Unfortunately the *capitoli* are no longer extant and we can only infer from other sources what their nature was.<sup>13</sup> With respect to the actual organization of the *Infiammati*, Gennari knows of the existence of only four officers: *principe*, *censori*, *sindaco*, and *cancelliere*.<sup>14</sup> In his letters Piccolomini is more specific; he tells us that the *principe* or president was assisted by at least three *consiglieri*, three *censori*, a *cancelliere*, a *segretario*, a *sindaco*, and a *tesoriere* (Letter 66). The election of the *principe* was held by-annually, in April and October.<sup>15</sup> The president was elected by secret ballot and remained in office for six months.<sup>16</sup> The constitution authorized him to appoint two censors who, in turn, appointed a third, all appointments being subject to the final approval of the entire body of members (Letter 66).

The chronological order of succession of the first four *principi* and the precise dates of their terms in office can be definitely reconstructed now

---

biano tutte quelle commodità et godano i medesimi priuilegi in loro assenza, che essi hanno et godono quando sono presenti, et siano per tali riconosciuti, quali sono appo noi. Però facciamo (mediante la presente) vero et indubitato testimonio in ciascun luogo et appresso qualunque persona come lo già ditto M. Alessandro Piccolhvomini è meritamente nel numero degli Accademici Infiammati. Et per fede di ciò, habbiamo sottoscritta questa di nostra mano propria et fattala suggellare secondo l'vsanza, co'l suggello nostro pubblico. Data in Padoua nell'Accademia nostra degli Infiammati il x giorno di Luglio l'anno MDXXXXX." Signed: "Noi Leone Orsino autor e primo principe della Accademia degli Infiammati affermiamo quanto di sopra si contiene. Io Fabritio Storni segretario per commessione." (Parchment MS, sixteenth century, *Pergamene Borghesi* P. 331, Archivio di Stato, Siena).

11. S. Bargagli, *Dell'imprese* (Venezia, 1594), p. 208.

12. Cf. J. Gaddi, *De scriptoribus non ecclesiasticis* (Florence, 1648), II, 379; Gennari, p. 15.

13. The loss of the statutes was lamented by Gennari (p. 17). It appears that when Varchi left Padua in 1541 to attend the lectures of Boccadiferno in Bologna, he took with him the *capitoli*, returned them during Piccolomini's presidency and later took them again. Whether this repeated peregrination resulted in their final loss is hard to say. On the other hand there is no evidence that they were ever printed.

14. Gennari, p. 17.

15. See Piccolomini's letters.

16. This information is inferred from Piccolomini's letters to Varchi. It is supported by Speroni who explicitly states in his inaugural address that he will abide by the statutes of the academy "non solamente li sei mesi che m'imponeste, ma il rimanente della mia vita ubbidirò volentieri." (*Opere*, II, 252).

with the data supplied by the same *carteggio* as follows: Giovanni Cornaro (April 1540 to September 1540); Galeazzo Gonzaga (October 1540 to March 1541); Alessandro Piccolomini (April 1541 to September 1541); Sperone Speroni (October 1541 to March 1542). Speroni and Gennari give the same order but without the dates.<sup>17</sup> Writers using Tomitano as a source are inaccurate in placing Speroni's installation as president in 1542 since the letters in which Piccolomini refers to the event clearly bear the date of 1541.

From the same letters we learn that a lavish ceremony characterized the celebration of the academy's anniversary and the inauguration of the new president (Letter 71). For the investiture of the *principe* the main hall of the building housing the academy was sumptuously bedecked. The president-elect entered the hall through a triumphal arch and acceded to the throne, the outgoing president welcoming and handing over to his successor a laurel staff.<sup>18</sup> The new officer then took the oath of office, probably placing his hand on the open volume of the *capitoli*. During both the anniversary and investiture ceremonies appropriate sections of the constitution were read and the purpose of the academy was re-emphasized (Letter 71).

The *Infiammati* convened at least twice a week, on Thursdays and Sundays (Letter 71). Indications are that the academy remained in session throughout the year, at least at the very beginning, for in the summer of 1541 we find Varchi protesting against the recess voted by the members (Letter 68).

The original program of academic activities was wide in scope, embracing all seven liberal arts. Greek, Latin, and Italian were regarded as official languages and thus both Italian and classical authors were read. Later the use of the classical languages was entirely proscribed and the subjects of discussion were limited to Italian authors and philosophy.<sup>19</sup> According to Tomitano this ultimate change was the result of a reform introduced by Speroni who maintained that theology, law, and medicine should be taught at the Studium, whereas the academy, regarded as a complement of the University, should concentrate on Tuscan.<sup>20</sup> Since rhetoric and poetry constituted the main objectives of the *Infiammati*, the study of philosophy was retained because of its usefulness in forming a good orator and poet. With the approval of the Speroni reform, the principal objective became and remained exclusively the advancement of the vernacular in the tradition established by Bembo.

17. Speroni, p. 251; Gennari, p. 16. The date of Cornaro's term is derived from letter no. 65; that of Gonzaga from the preface to Piccolomini's *Lettura fatta nell'Accademia degli Infiammati MDXXXXI* (Bologna, 1541); the other terms are accounted for by letters 66 through 73.

18. Letter 72. Also Speroni, p. 252.

19. Gennari, p. 18.

20. Tomitano, *Ragionamenti* (Venezia, 1546), p. 18. Cf. G. Margiotta, *Le Origini italiane de la question des anciens et des modernes* (Roma, 1953), p. 104.

The years during which Piccolomini sent his reports to Varchi mark the constant growth and prosperity of the academy; by the summer of 1541 the number of regular resident members had reached the total of twenty-eight (Letter 68). Recruitment of new members was vigorously promoted and special efforts were made to attract the more important literati of the day. In this respect Piccolomini was instrumental in sponsoring the admission of his friend Pietro Aretino.<sup>21</sup> The first attempts to gain Molza as a new member date back to this period also (Letter 71).

The lectures of Bartolomeo Lombardi on the *Poetics* of Aristotle may be cited as one of the more important events in the early annals of the *Infiammati*. Plans for the Veronese philosopher's visit had been formulated at least as early as May 1541 and the news of his arrival was greeted with great expectation by all the literati of Padua (Letter 71). "Et il Lombardo ha fatto il suo principio, a giudicio di ognuno, miracoloso," Piccolomini proudly informs Varchi when the lectures finally began in December of 1541 (Letter 73). However, at this point Piccolomini's reports to Varchi are interrupted and we have no account by him of the sudden death that overtook Lombardi a short time after the inaugural lecture.<sup>22</sup>

An unpleasant incident, which for a while seemed to threaten the very life of the young academy, occurred during the last months of 1541. At the beginning of October the academy had reconvened after its summer recess and elections for the new session were held. Speroni was elected *Principe* and his "coronation" was set for the first of November (Letter 70). As was the custom, the new president was responsible for all the arrangements connected with the ceremony of investiture. But since Speroni had shown indifference in discharging this duty and the date of the "coronation" was close at hand, the *Infiammati* began to worry about the fate of their academy. At first the original date had to be postponed because Speroni had left Padua (Letter 70). Owing to this attitude on the part of the president-elect, the members feared that the long hoped for Lombardi lectures would have to be cancelled (Letters 70, 71). It was only after Piccolomini called on Speroni at his villa outside Padua, and after much persuasion, that the newly elected president consented to go through with the "coronation" which, meanwhile, had to be postponed a second time to November 13 (Letter 71).

21. Letter of Piccolomini to Aretino (March 20, 1541) in "Lettere scritte a Pietro Aretino," *Scelta di curiosità letterarie inedite e rare dal secolo XIII al XVII*. Ed. Romagnoli (Bologna, 1874), II, part I, 229.

22. Lombardi's death is described by V. Maggi in his preface to the commentary on the *Poetics*: "Is igitur, nonus iam hic agitur annus, ubi in Patavina Inflammatorum Academia [. . .] *Poetics* Aristotelis librum publice cum explanare voluisset; exordio, quod in hoc volumine primum legitur, vix dum habito: sputo sanguinis primum, phthoë deinde correptus, in medio vitae cursu morte praereptus est, incredibile mehercle omnium, qui eum norant, moerore [. . .]" *Vincenti Madii Brixiani et Bartholomei Lombardi Veronensis in Aristotelis Librum de Poetica communes explanationes* (Venice, 1550). Since Lombardi began his lectures at the *Infiammati* toward the end of 1541 it is clear that Toffanin is mistaken in asserting that Lombardi died in 1540 (*La Fine dell'umanesimo*, [Torino, 1920], p. 87).



Alessandro Piccolomini, who had arrived in Padua in 1538 to continue his university studies under Maggi, Delfino, and Mantova, was among the first to be invited to help in the establishment of the new association, especially in consideration of his previous membership in the Accademia degli Intronati of Siena. In his treatise on academies the Sienese writer Scipione Bargagli asserts that the Paduan circle owed its origin to a *number* of Intronati, a claim which smacks of considerable exaggeration. Indeed, as Gennari hinted, Bargagli's statement is consistent with the facts only insofar as it applies to Piccolomini.<sup>23</sup>

Starting as one of the first members, Piccolomini soon found himself entrusted with the major responsibilities of administration. In the fall of 1540, during the presidency of Galeazzo Gonzaga, he held office as secretary and the following spring he succeeded Gonzaga as *Principe* (Letter 66). But, of course, the major contribution which Piccolomini brought to the *Infiammati* was a literary one. In the field which most interested the academy, the vernacular, the Sienese humanist was respected as an undisputed authority, as evidenced by the words Speroni attributes to Silvestro Girelli in one of his dialogues: "Voi, dal quale la Sanese e la Padovana accademia prende esempio di bene scrivere e ragionare, facilmente a vostro senno me reggerete, ponendo freno alla lingua sì fattamente, che oltre al termine da voi prescritto non fia cosa, che la transporti [. . .]."<sup>24</sup>

Conforming with a custom which became a commonplace in literary societies, Piccolomini often read his own poetic compositions, which later were gathered into his canzoniere titled *Cento sonetti* (Rome, 1549). There is reason to believe that some members of the academy subjected these sonnets to learned commentaries in the same fashion that Piccolomini commented on verses sent to him by his Sienese friend, Laudomia Forteguerri.<sup>25</sup> As a matter of fact, a chain reaction of readings and commentaries was produced when the *Infiammati* directed their critical activities to a number of sonnets composed by certain "gentildonne sanesi" in response to a sonnet written by Piccolomini on the occasion of his visit to Petrarch's tomb at Arquà in August 1540.<sup>26</sup> In these literary exercises the sonnet under consideration merely served as a springboard for the commentator's flight into the realms of rhetoric, philosophy, physics, astronomy, etc., as is well exemplified by the better known "Lezione sur un sonetto del Bembo" delivered by Varchi at the same academy.<sup>27</sup>

23. S. Bargagli, *Delle lodi dell'Accademie* (Venezia, 1594), p. 533. Cf. Gennari, p. 16.

24. Speroni, "Dialogo in lode delle donne," *Opere*, II, 334.

25. *Lettura fatta nell'Accademia degli Infiammati MDXXXI* (Bologna, 1541). This lecture was printed without the author's permission (Letter 69).

26. *Lettere all'Aretino*, ed. Landoni, II, Part I, 235 ff. For a detailed treatment of the pilgrimages to and poems on Petrarch's tomb see Abdelkader Salza, "Da Valchiusa ad Arquà," *Raccolta di studi di storia e critica letteraria dedicata a F. Flamini* (Pisa, 1918), pp. 724-83.

27. *Opere di B. Varchi* (Trieste, 1859), II, 562.



Like his friend Varchi, Piccolomini also established his reputation in Padua as a lecturer in moral philosophy. His exposition of the *Nicomachean Ethics* brought him renown beyond the confines of the academy to the extent that many students would desert their courses at the University in order to hear Piccolomini at the Accademia degli Infiammati.<sup>28</sup> Contrary to what most biographers have stated in the past, Piccolomini delivered these lectures at the academy exclusively and never taught moral philosophy or any other subject at the Studium at which he was enrolled as a student.<sup>29</sup>

Piccolomini's ethico-pedagogical treatise, *De la institutione*, as well as other scientific works which saw the light during his residence in Padua, are, no doubt, the by-products not only of his university studies but also of the academic exercises just mentioned.<sup>30</sup> Both the commentaries on the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* of Aristotle, which Piccolomini wrote in his old age, have a filiation that can be traced to the earlier influences at the University of Padua and the Accademia degli Infiammati.<sup>31</sup> His plan to translate into Italian the major scientific and philosophical works of the Peripatetics, first confided to Pietro Aretino in March 1541, was at least encouraged if not determined by the Accademia which entertained identical objectives.<sup>32</sup> Finally, one cannot but stress the fact that from this time on Piccolomini's activity as a writer was to remain essentially that of a popularizer.

In 1542 the Siennese writer left Padua for Bologna where he studied under Lodovico Boccadiferro, the Aristotelian philosopher who had previously attracted Varchi. Thus Piccolomini's active association with the Infiammati came to an end. At the time of his departure from Padua, the academy was still prosperously growing, but not many years later its fortunes declined and by 1554 the flame on Mount Oeta was completely extinguished.<sup>33</sup>

28. S. Bargagli, *Oratione nella morte di Alessandro Piccolomini* (Venezia, 1594), p. 554.

29. A. Piccolomini, *De nona ecclesiastici calendari pro legitimo paschalis celebrationis tempore restituendi forma libellulus* (Siena, 1578), p. 29. Cf. also my article "A. Piccolomini, Teacher of Moral Philosophy," *Italica*, XXXIII (1956), 22.

30. Besides his *De la institutione di tutta la vita de l'huomo nato nobile, e in città libera, libri X in lingua toscana* (Venezia, 1542), Piccolomini also wrote the following works which appeared during his stay at Padua: *Alexandri aphrodisiensis maximi peripatetici in quatuor libros meteorologicorum Aristotelis, commentatio lucidissima, Alexandro Piccolomineo interprete* (Venice, 1540); *De la sfera del mondo libri quattro in lingua toscana* (Venezia, 1540); *De le stelle fisse libro uno* (Venezia, 1540).

31. The commentaries on the three books of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* appeared in 1565, 1569, and 1572 respectively. An Italian translation of the text alone was printed in 1571. In 1572 Piccolomini first published his Italian translation of the *Poetics* and in 1575 followed up with his commentary, *Annotazioni nel libro della Poetica d'Aristotele*.

32. In the letter to Aretino (March 20, 1541) Piccolomini states: "Io già più mesi e forse anni sono, ho avuto in animo et ho più che mai, di ridur ne la lingua nostra, non solo alcune cose di astrologia e di cosmografia, scritte da Tolomeo; ma ancor buona parte de le cose filosofiche, così naturali, come morali, secondo la via dei peripatetici; non traducendo, ma ampliando dove bisogna, di maniera però che io non mi parti dal parer primamente di Aristotele e di poi dei primi suoi greci espositori."

33. Gennari, p. 23.

## MANUSCRIPT LETTERS OF ALESSANDRO PICCOLOMINI

Biblioteca Nazionale, Firenze

"Lettere al Varchi," *Autografi Palatini*, Vol. II.

NO. 65

*Outside:* Al molto Illustre et honorato Signore e Signor mio osseruandissimo. Il molto magnifico M. Giouan Cornero. Principe meritissimo degli Accademici Infiammati.

*Inside:* Molto Magnifico et Honoratissimo Signore e Signor mio osseruandissimo.

Ad vna dela Vostra Magnificentia ch'io riceuei già più che dieci giorni sono, penso che la Escellentia del Sozino in nome mio rispondesse a bastanza, perchè trouandosi ella al'hor qua, le lessi la lettera, e la informai di quanto m'occorriua in risposta di quella. Di nuouo questa mattina, che siamo alli XII ho riceuuto vn'altra di Vostra Magnificentia doue par, ch'ella si marauigli, ch'io non habbia, nè accettato, nè refutato il Segretariato, che le Signorie Vostre m'han dato benignamente. A che non accade ch'io respond'altro, sennò che parte di ciò è stato cagione, lo sperar io di gior:o in giorno ritornarmene a Padoua, e parte ancora il pensar, che da'l tacer si prendesse argomento dell'accettatione; e massimamente confidandomi io, che le Vostre Signorie si tenghin per cosa chiara, ch'io non sia mai (sennò molto necessitato) per refutar'incarcho, che le mi ponghino.

Come e' si sia, io ringratio le Signorie Vostre che habbino hauuto memoria di me, non che Dio, che volenterissimamente io riceua il peso che le mi danno. Saluo però, quando con questa accettatione, possa star'insieme, la mia lontananza d'alcuni pochi giorni più; questo dico perchè quella medesima cagione che mi ha tenuto qua, fino ad hora, mi spinge ancora con gran forza, alcuni giorni più; questo solo so io di certo (se maggior cosa non accade) che non sarà oggi ad viii giorni che sarò in Padoua. Onde se questa poca cosa, è per porger impedimento all'accettatione del Segretariato, le Vostre Signorie disponghin del tutto a lor modo; che d'ogni cosa sarò contentissimo. Et questo habbin per certo, che se buona e calda cagione non mi tenesse qua, al primo auiso mene tornauo; che così mi harebbe fatto forza e farammi sempre, il desiderio che tengho di obbedire alli ordini dell'i Accademici Infiammati; i quali aho e riuersco quanto poche altre cose.

Non m'occorre altro. La Vostra Magnificentia stia sana, e si degni di comandarmi et amarmi.

Dela Villa di Garzignano, el di xii di settembre nel XL.

Dela Vostra Magnificentia seruitore

Alisandro Piccolomini

NO. 66

*Outside:* Al molto Honoratissimo e Dottissimo Signor mio Benedetto Varchi mio Signor osseruandissimo.

*Inside:* Molto Honorato M. Benedetto Signor mio osseruandissimo.

Sapendo io da M. Vgolino, che Vostra Signoria si troua in Bologna, mi è paruto, venendo costà M. Justiniano da Salò, e M. Marco Coradello, di rinnouarle nela memoria che io le sono, sì come io gli ero, stando ella qua, affettionatissimo e molto desideroso che ancor ella seguiti di volermi bene, come ella faceva: di che mi potrà dar chiarissimo segno, comandandomi a le volte, se cosa le occorre che io le possa seruir. Da M. Justiniano, potrà saper Vostra Signoria quanto occorre intorno a la vita del 'Accademia; ancorchè da che la partì di qua, non si sia adunata doppo le vacantie, sennò la Domenica passata, che lesse M. Lorenzo Lenzi alcune cose legali sopra la materia de falsis ad legem Corneliam, ne la qual lettione sodisfece vniuersalissimamente, et a me assaissimo; che certo si portò molto bene; e vi vennero più Dottori di leggi. Confermaronsi i Conseglieri quali, Io eletto già principe, mi l'haueua eletti; che furon M. Giouan Cornaro, et il Panico. Rimase terzo Censore M. Speroni, eletto dai 2 già creati, M. Vgolino Martelli e M. Giouanni del 'Anguillara. Il segretario già rimase M. Cosmo, et M. Lenzi il tesauriere. Il primo giorno di Maggio m'ingegnerò che le cerimonie vadin con ordine, e grauità; e parimente di poi farò ogni sforzo che le cose passin manco mal che sarà possibile; ma facisi come si voglia, sempre si conoscerà, e già si conosce troppo scopertamente, che il Varchi è lontano. Harò caro che Vostra Signoria mi auisi qualche cosa di cotesti studij e del modo di legger del Bocca di Ferro; e del successo di cotesta Accademia, e mi sarebbe grato di saper se il Signor Molza è in Bologna. Non le mando alcuni sonetti che mi son venuti di alcune Gentildonne senesi, perchè M. Hemmanuel gli potrà mostrar, che già so gli ha hauuti dal Conte Troilo. Sarà buon che Vostra Signoria si ricordi di auisare a chi lasciò i Capitoli del'Accademia o cosa si potesse far'ad hauerli; e di questo già vn mese ordinò l'Accademia che M. Vgolino gliene douesse scriuer. Vostra Signoria non manchi di gratia di ricordarsene. Non mi occorre altro che dirle per hora. Quello sia sempre certo che io l'amo assai, e mi comandi qualche volta. E le piacerà di raccomandarmi a i miei molto honorati M. Alberto e M. Carlo. E stia sana e felice.

Di Padoua el dì xxvii d'Aprile 1541.

Seruitor suo

Alisandro Piccolomini

NO. 71

*Outside:* Al molto Magnifico et Honorato M. Benedetto Varchi mio osseruandissimo.

*Inside:* M. Benedetto molto Honoratissimo e mio osseruandissimo.

Per vna vostra dei ix di Maggio non mi par di cognoscer che vi sien venute nele mani due mie lettere, l'vna mandataui per M. Francesco da Colle, che staua in casa del Sozino, e l'altra data a M. Vgolino che la legasse con le sue, come prima vi scriueua. Ma perchè facilmente può esser che a questa hora, vi sieno state rendute, non replicarò altrimenti quanto in esse si conteneua. Ho preso piacere assai di veder per la vostra non solo che hauiate alcuna memoria del'amicitia nostra, ma ancora che vi sia a cor grandemente l'honor dela nostra Accademia; el che parimente è marauigliosamente piaciuto a tutti i Signori Infiammati, ai quali et insieme nel'Accademia, e particolarmente a ciaschuno, ho fatto le vostre raccomandationi e mostrato l'ardente e affetionata memoria che tenete di loro. Non mostrai lor pubblicamente nel'Accademia la lettera vostra, come haueuo pensato, poichè mi

accadde che vno andasse a Verona, doue si troua M. Bartolommeo Lombardo, al quale giudicai che fusse bene che insieme con le mie lettere andasse ancora la vostra, acciochè egli conoscesse che quel che io gli iscriueuo del'espettatione che si ha dela sua lettura dela poetica, non solo in Padoua ma fuora in più luoghi, e particolarmente in Bologna; fusse confermato da'l testimonio de le vostre lettere. Io gli ho scritto con quella caldezza che ho saputo et in mio nome et in nome del'Accademia; et il Maggio parimente gli ha scritto, il qual secondo che mi dimostra, arde assai del desiderio di cotal cosa; et io lo credo, poichè conosco che questa cosa è così interesse di esso M. Bartolommeo come di noi altri, per più ragioni che vi potete pensar. Apreso a questo domane si parte M. Giouanbattista Bagolini per Verona, e mi dice che principalmente va per menar M. Bartolommeo a questo effetto, e fra pochi giorni sarà di ritorno. Et io di tutto 'l successo vi auisarò continuamente.

Proposi la prima session, che venne doppo le vostre lettere, lo Escellentissimo M. Luca da Imola in nome vostro; e nel medesimo tempo fu proposto M. Anton Lapini; i quali due, essendo senza discrepanza venti nel consiglio, ci parue che il giorno medesimo (fuor del costume, per esser persone segnalate) fussen ballottati, e si ottennero con molto fauor. Ho commesso al Cancellier che faccia il priuilegio, il qual se questa tarda fino a domane, vi mandarò legato con essa. E voi in questo mezo, se altre persone di questa sorte, vi venghan per le mani, da arricchirne la nostra Accademia, vi piacerà di farlo. Et del Molza sopra tutto, che intendo che egli è in Bologna. Qua l'Accademia, non si può negar che non vada assai prosperamente mantenendosi; e quel che più mi fa marauiglia è che vi concorrono vn mondo di forastieri a le lettioni così del Giobbia come dela Domenica, di maniera che più ci potiam dolere di alcuni nostri Accademici, che dei forastieri, quanto all'esser frequenti. Ma con tutto questo si vede molto scopertamente che ci manca la diligentia vostra, e di M. Alberto e di M. Carlo, i quali mai non mancauano.

Proposi già all'Accademia intorno al Natale che ciaschun douesse dir il parere suo così quanto all'apparato quanto alle cerimonie che si douesse far. E non dicendo alcuno cosa nissuna, consigliai che douesse esser in questa forma: che si cercassero 2 proueditori che douessero esser sopra all'apparato, determinando loro quanto hauessero da spendere e quanto sontuosamente hauessero da farlo, e venuto il giorno determinato, ale 19 hore, cominciassero le cerimonie. In cotal guisa, prima in cathedra quel che deue orare facesse un'oratione, doue lodasse il Signor Leon Orsini, reducesse a nominar il fondamento dell'Accademia, e rendesse la cagion di tutti i Magistrati, e ordini dell'Accademia; e in fine esortasse i Signori Infiammati alle virtù e al ardor del saper. Doppo l'oratione, il secretario leggesse pubblicamente vna parte dei Capitoli, quella parte cioè che consiste nel narrar il principio dell'Accademia e l'offitio che deue hauere ciaschun magistrato, lassando quella parte che consiste nel modo di crear i magistrati. Apreso a questo, si mostrassero componimenti fatti da più in lode dell'impresa dell'Accademia, tra le quali compositioni sarà benissimo che voi ne mandiate qualchuno. Doppo questo il secretario con alcune parole renderà e consegnerà al principe tutte le compositioni del'anno passato, et il principe accettandole, le consegnerà a 2 censori annuali creati a posta per questo, e pubblicamente dirà loro quel che n'habbin da far', cioè che fra vn mese l'habbin emendate e trattate al modo che parrà loro, e che doppo passato il mese designato, le costituiscano in man del principe e dei consiglieri. E questo sia il

fine. Piacque questo discorso et ordin di cerimonie; e finalmente fu rimesso al principe con i consiglieri, tra i quali il Cornaro voleua aggiugnervi vna messa pubblica e solenne ne la sala dell'Accademia; ma non si ottenne, anzi non hebbe più che cinque ballotte in fauor. E così fu risoluto nel modo che di sopra, per il di secondo di Pasqua di Spirito Santo; l'oration fu data al Girello.

Non mi souien altro che dirui, saluo che mi voliate bene e mi auisiate alcuna volta de gli studij di Bologna, e come il Bocca di Ferro vi sodisfa. E se cosa posso in contento vostro, mi comandate, perchè desiderarò io sempre di fare cosa che grata vi sia. Raccomandatemi assai alli miei Honoratissimi M. Alberto e M. Carlo. Farò le vostre raccomandationi al Panico et a tutti. State sano e felice.

Di Padoua el di xxiiii di Maggio 1541

Di Vostra Signoria seruitore  
Alisandro Piccolomini

NO. 67

Molto Honorato e mio osseruandissimo M. Benedetto.

Per vn mio fratello mandai già 8 giorni in vn legato di lettere che io mandai a M. Emanuel Grimaldi, vn altro legatetto a voi, doue era il privilegio di M. Luca. E perchè la vostra lettera doue mi auisauate il nome de la famiglia di quello non fu a tempo, che son pochi giorni che la riceuei, per questo non si potè nel privilegio por la famiglia. Ma non importa, che vi è la patria et il titolo del Dottorato. Le raccomandationi che di nuouo m'imponete che io faccia in nome vostro, con diligentia si son fatte. E parimente all'Accademia, la qual va così intertenendosi secondo che meglio si può; e più tosto ben che male, fu fatto il secondo giorno dela Pentecoste il Natale doue fur quelle cerimonie che per l'altra vi scrissi che vi sarebbero, saluo che il leggger dei Capitoli, che per non l'hauer voi mandati hora non si poter leggiere. Vi piacerà di sollecitargli; che così ho detto in nome vostro, cioè che in breve fareste metter mano a transcriuerli. L'oration che si fece il Natale, contra al giuditio di ognuno fu bellissima, e M. Vincenzo Girelli, che fu l'orator m'ha . . . \* assai. Credo che M. Ugolino ve la manderà. M. Bartolommeo Lombardi è tornato e si rimette in voi di quanto si ha da far. Domenica si consularà del come e del quando, et si concluderà (per quanto io potrò) che si spedisca più tosto che sarà possibile, si spedisca dico, cioè si cominci. E del tutto minutamente vi darò auiso. Harò molto caro M. Benedetto, poi che così vi lodate del Bocca di Ferro, che duraste tanta fatica di far che io hauesse 2 o 3 lettioni di quelle che fatte tenete più belle, che gli habbia lette in questi giorni; nel secondo del mese di giugno non vi si scordi. Altro non mi souien che scriuerui, saluo che raccomandarmiui e pregharui che con M. Alberto e M. Carlo insieme mi comandate qualche volta.

Qua son arriuate per 2 o 3 giorni la Signora Giouanna Malatesta e la Signora Lucretia Pia, due gran donne a i tempi nostri, dele quali fa mentione l'Ariosto. Penso che l'Accademia farà parte di qualche farsa se le conuiene con esse; poichè quelle molto se le mostran partiali et affettionate.

State sani e felicj. Di Padoua el di viiii di Giugno 1541.

Seruitor  
Alisandro Piccolomini

(\*) This part of the original manuscript was damaged.



NO. 68

M. Benedetto mio, honoratissimo et amatissimo

Ho da risponder a due vostre, l'vna del secondo giorno dopp'il Corpo di Cristo con la quale erano i Capitoli degli Infiammati, e l'altra dei 24 di Giugno doue mi ricercate ch'io propongha nel'Accademia M. Antonio Anselmi, quale io cognosco, che fu qua al principio di Giugno. Prima quanto a i Capitoli, è stato benissimo fatto il mandargli per molti rispetti e massime perchè cominciavano a mormorarne. Io gli darò in man di M. Sperone, perchè dicono molti, et credo che sia'l vero se ben mi ricordo, che M. Sperone et M. Alberto del Bene furon costituiti riformatori, o vero riueditori di essi; e per non esserci M. Alberto, resta che M. Sperone gli vegha, e seco forse vn altro che si costituirà in cambio di M. Alberto. E questo si farà per essersi già tal cosa deliberata come sapete; non già che io stimi che si muti cosa che molto importi; e subito che saran riformati, faremogli scriuer in bonissima lettera, e forse stampar, se a voi parrà ben fatto, come già vi pareva. Poichè in tutti i modi so ben di trouar vie che sien notissimi agli accademici acciò sappin quanto habbin da osseruar. Di tutti harete auiso di mano in mano. Di M. Antonio Anselmi non si è fatto niente, poichè per le vacantie del'Accademia, che si fecero la Domenica passata, non si son poi adunati gli Infiammati. Vedrò di fargli vn giorno adunar a questo effetto spetialmente, se si potrà; questo dico perchè ne son rimasti pochissimi in Padoua. E poi che io son a proposito de le vacantie, mi dispiace che per le vostre lettere io conosca che non vi piaccino, e tanto più che per lettera di M. Emanuelle intendo questo medesimo e che a lui parimente non soddisfanno. Intorno a che non vi voglio dir altro, sennò che non senza ben ruminar questa si è fatta, perchè molte cause importantissime lo richiedeano, che non si posson ben esplicar con lettera. Basti questo che prima che si facessero le vacantie, fui per tal conto insieme co Maggio, con lo Sperone, con il Panico, e col Bagolin; et insomma considerate più cose, risoluemmo che fusse ben fatto. E che sia'l vero che tal caso fusse con ragion guidato, cognosciatelo da questo che di 28 accademici, cioè di 28 ballotte, si concluse per 26 ad altri tempi. Meglio non raguagliarò.

Questo ben vi dico, che io penso che al tempo nuouo, cioè al principio di Ottobre, sarà l'Accademia più in credito che fusse mai, perchè molti si preparan a far belle lezioni e bei componimenti, secondo che io intendo; a che io et insieme nel'Accademia, ma spetialmente a ciascheduno mi son ingegnato di persuadergli. Oltra la Poetica del Lombardo, conforme promission di lui e del Maggio, non mancarà in canto alcuno; e nel'Accademia pubblicamente si è promesso.

Duolmi che non si possin hauer alcune lezioni del Bocca di ferro; ma non potendosi ci patiran queste voglie. Ho ben caro che egli sia sì cortese in risponder a i dubii che gli presento inanzi; si come ho visto per vna lettera vostra al Maggio e poi che gli è sì benigno, vi vorrei pregar che voi gli domandaste il suo giuditio intorno ad vna istantia che io ho fatta contra vna sua determinatione nela materia del Iride; poichè io vedo i suoi scritti, e tra molte cose in che io gli ho contradetto, vna ve n'è che harei caro di saper il parere suo. Et è nel mio Trattato del Iride stampato con le Meteore di Alisandro, a carta 60 nela colonna quarta e massime appresso al fine; ma bisognerà leggiergli tutta la suppositione, che comprende nela colonna terza. Vedete di farlo destramente, quando vi vien ben.

Le vostre raccomandationi si faranno tosto. Raccomandatemi a M. Alberto e M. Carlo, e agli altri miei amici. E comandatemi qualche volta. State sano.

Di Padoua el di vi di luglio 1541.

Di Vostra Signoria seruitore  
Alisandro Piccolomini



NO. 68

M. Benedetto mio Honoratissimo et osseruandissimo

Per M. Celso ho hauuto vna vostra insieme con un mazetto di lettere a M. Ugolino, quali gli mandai subito in villa, doue egli si trouaua e si troua. De le vacantie ch'ella mi tocua nela sua non accade che io vi dica altro, sennò che non furon fatte nè per voglia di riposar, nè per poca affettion verso l'Accademia (questo dico misurando gli altri animi col mio), nè per poco discorrerle, ma solo per honor di quello. E siate certo M. Benedetto mio, che mal per l'Accademia se non si faeuano, come meglio vi dirò, se al tempo nuouo sarete de'nostri, come mi par che mi accenniate, cosa che grandemente mi piacerà. Di quanto mi dite del Bocca di Ferro, non accade che altro vi dica, sennò che come l'occasion vi si porge, voliate far quanto vi dissi per l'altra mia; e sodisfacendo egli per sua cortesia a questa dimanda, se ne farà forse del'altre, che certo questo sarebbe bel modo da imparar per ogni lettera qualche cosa di nuouo.

A M. Sperone e a tutti quegli che mi ricordate che io vi raccomandi loro, non marco mai senza che altro ven scriua. Mi ero scordato, M. Benedetto, di dirui come M. Celso Sozini, al passar per Bologna, ha trouata, cosa a me molto discara e marauigliosa, et è che in Bologna hanno stampato la mia lettura sopra'l sonetto di Madonna Laudomia; che certo mi ha dato e mi dà per infiniti rispetti assai fastidio; e ricercando io M. Celso se sapeua come quei librari l'hauessero hauuta, mi dice che sa di certo che è venuta d'Ancona, doue forse è andata di Roma; dice forse, perchè già prima di Febraro, ricercandomi Mons. Orsini di voler vederla, gliela mandai. Come si sia, vi pregho M. Benedetto, che occorrendoui, voliatemi difender con dir ch'ella non possa esser sennò corrotta e guasta, per esser stata fatta tal cosa senza veder di farmene saper niente. Duolmi ancora tanto più per esserci il nome del'Accademia, a la grandezza dela quale si conuiene altra cosa che questa o simili. Patienza.

Non occorre che altro dirmiui, sennò che mi raccomandiate a M. Alberto e M. Carlo, et a voi stesso infinitamente, ai quali harò caro sempre di far seruitio, desideroso che mi comandino. State sano e lieto.

Di Padoua el di xx di Agosto 1541

Seruitore vostro

Alisandro Piccolomini

NO. 70

Molto Honorato M. Benedetto Signor mio osseruandissimo

Lo sperar'io che ritornando sano com'intendo, voi douesse esser ogni giorno qua da noi, mi ha fatto sospender lo scriuerui alcuna cosa che io desideraua che voi sapeste; e perchè ancora spero che siate per conferirui tosto a riueder due giorni li vostri amici di Padoua, mi serbarò a ragionar con voi in presentia; solo dicendoui come al principio d'ottobre essendo finito il tempo dele vacantie del'Accademia, si fece il nuouo Principe e gli altri magistrati secondo il costume. Rimase Principe M. Sperone, il quale benignamente accettò'l principato. Prepararonsi per il primo di nouembre per la incoronatione sua tutte l'orationi et altre cerimonie che si soglion far. Et era tal cosa in Padoua in tanta aspettatione che è marauiglia a pensarla. Ma auuicinandosi il tempo, e veggendo noi che M. Sperone non pareua che pensasse punto a tal cosa, più volte gli andai a parlare. E sempre mi mostraua buon animo, saluo che all'ultimo, mi accennò che non pensaua trouarsi presente a

tal'atto, ma che costituirebbe in suo luogo chi riceuesse la bacchetta. A questo gli dissi quanto mi pareua al proposito.

Cominciò ad andar a spasso questa fama che M. Sperone non douea trouarsi presente, e diede molto sturbo vniuersalmente, e spetialmente agli accademici. Ma appressandoci più al giorno, cioè a 2 giorni che fu hieri, vedendo che nè egli nè altro in suo luogo pigliaua cura nè di preparar sale, nè di altro, anzi parendo che pronto a tal cosa non si hauesse il pensiero, parse a gli Accademici hieri doppio la lettione che 2, che furon il Girello e M. Felice, andassero subito a M. Sperone, per veder di intender quel che fusse il parer suo in tal cosa. Rispose che doueua andar a Venetia questa mattina che siamo a l'vltimo di ottobre, non altro. Io al netto sapendo questo, mandai subito vn bullettin dietroglì a le barche, nel qual liberamente lo preghauo che hauesse in tal cosa cura del'honor dell'Accademia, e non la lasciasse in sedia vacante in tanta confusione, e romor di molti diuersi ragionamenti che si fan da molti. E che certo questo saria vno smattamento de gli Infiammati vituperosissimo. E vi dico M. Benedett., che se mai haueua seguito l'Accademia, hora l'haueua più che mai; che non vi potrei mai dir quanto si parli d'essa e quanto si sperasse in lei questo anno. E particolarmente M. Bartolommeo Lombardo sarà qua di questa settimana per cominciar la Poetica. Talchè è certo cosa degna di pietà a veder che in vn punto vada tal cosa in perditione. Et ci è vn mormorio in Padoua fra le persone marauiglioso. Più a lungo ne ragionarò con voi se per sorte verrete qua. E non venendo, auuisatemelo, che verrò costà io, che in tutti modi voglio conferir tal cosa con voi, perchè mi da vn fastidio marauiglioso. Ho inteso questa mattina che M. Sperone non è andato in Venetia, ma in villa, il che più mi dispiace. Vorrei saper il successo del risanarsi di M. Vgolino. E vi bacio le mani.

Di Padoua, il dì vltimo di ottobre 1541.

Alisandro Piccolomini

NO. 72

*Outside:* Al Molto Magnifico et Honorato M. Benedetto Varchi Signor mio osseruandissimo

*Inside:* Molto Magnifico Messer Benedetto mio osseruandissimo

Per la vostra, e più per quanto mi ha detto M. Piccolomo ho cognosciuto quanto vi habbia conturbato questa confusione e suspension dele cose del'Accademia. E inuero non mi marauiglio punto del fastidio che n'hauete, cognoscendo io quanto di core siate affettionato Infiammato; et a me parimente daua vn tal caso grandissimo trauaglio di mente per infiniti rispetti, che voi ben conoscete. Vi dissi come domenica sera M. Sperone hauea risposto che non poteua esserui e che douea il lune partir di Padoua, e che al tornar di Venetia saremmo insieme. Non andò già egli a Venetia, ma in villa. Et io sempre son stato attento al suo ritorno; il quale sapendo io che fu hieri, andai questa mattina a trouarlo per vltimar quel che hauesse da esser o ben o male. Egli al mio arriuò, preoccupandomi, mostrò molta l'affettion ch'egli ha all'Accademia; e ristregnendo io i ragionamenti più al particular, in somma mostraua che fusse per essergli carico in quanto a non so che, il pigliare lo scettro egli stesso. E doppio più parole, finalmente disse che non poteua mancar alli Accademici e che lo torrebbe, ma che voleua non impacciarsi in Apparato, nè

in niente; a che io mi offesi di proueder al tutto. Et egli soggiunse che se ne contentaua, ma che voleua che l'apparato non fusse magnifico come l'altra volta, ma modesto molto, tal che non si ornasse sennò quanto andaua oltre il palco, coprendo solo la finestra grande; senza far arco trionfale a la porta di fuori, et in somma, ogni cosa humilmente. E così rimanemmo. Ma parlando del giorno, per esser oggi Giobbia, nè esserci tempo pur a publicar cotal cosa per domenica, essendo che già in Padoua le persone si eran disperate di questa cosa, et ancora perchè li oratori han dismesso, potessero riaccomodarsi. Risoluemmo per la domenica che seguìua, che sarà alli 13 di nouembre. Et io quanto per me si potrà non mancarò di cosa alcuna. Harò carissimo che con noi voi ben ci siate in quel giorno. E tal volta M. Vgolino ci potrà esser, il qual intendo esser già più giorni senza febre, e acquista le forze prosperamente. Di che ho grandissimo contento e tanto più quanto l'altro giorno per il pericol dela sua malattia mi ero preso tal fastidio, qualmente si riceue ad vn che l'ami con tutto l'animo e cognosca quanto vaglia, e sua per valor raccomandano tanti molto. Vi piacerà, se mai andate dal'Aretino, dirli come non li piacendo quel mezo verso *e sua seguace apresso* voglio che si muti e dica *E l'arte a quella apresso*. Et è in vn sonetto mio fatto sopra il ritratto del'Ambasciatore di Spagna. Harò caro che lo vediate e mi diciate quel che vene parà, e così a M. Ugolino. State sano, e comandatemi, lassandoui, se è possibile, veder.

Di Padoua il dì 3 di nouembre 1541.\*

Alisandro Piccolomini

NO. 73

*Outside:* Al magnifico e molto Honorato M. Benedetto Varchi fiorentino mio Signor osseruandissimo.

*Inside:* Molto Honorato M. Benedetto mio osseruandissimo

Poco da poi che partiste di qua vi scrissi come, tenendomi io per certo che voi haueste lassati i capitoli dell'Accademia a M. Ugolino, mi marauigliai di non trouar che gli haueste lasciati; e massimamente che quando ve gli dei vi dissi che non eran ancora tutti riformati, e che tutto'l giorno ce ne seruiamo. Non di meno perchè mi diceste che gli riportareste o mandereste il dì poi, non curai. La prima sessione fatta nell'Accademia dappoi la vostra partita, essendo bisogno per la constitution del sindaco di vederli, e dicendo io che eran tornati in man vostre, se ne dolser molti Accademici, e particolarmente il Cornaro, e'l Girello et altri, dolendosi ancora di me. Io subito vi scrissi, preghandoui che essendoui scordato di lasciarli, vedeste di mandargli. E così vi ripregho replicando che, per hauer parte di causa di questa cosa, mi vorrei emendar col fargli tornar. A voi non importan niente, e a noi farete sommo piacer. Il Cornaro m'ha domandato più volte se ho hauuto risposta. Io ho sempre detto che non può esser altrimenti, sennò che vi scordaste di lasciarli, e che io tengo per certo che subito che harete mie lettere, gli mandarete. E di questo a bastanza.

Apresso a questo vi ricordo, M. Benedetto, la cosa al Escellente Bocca di ferro, ancor che io credo che non bisogna ricordarlo, sapendo io che ci sarete diligente; perchè vi tengo ben sincero, integro, et fauoreuol del vero, e per questo desideroso

\* Salutation in original MS is damaged.

di veder in questa cosa chi di quei due grandi homini habbia ragione. A me par mill'anni di saper al meno l'espositione di quel per *alcuna et alcuna persona* per veder se gliè più in fantasia di diuersi organi, il che non crederò mai che raffermi. Alcuni gentil'homini Venetiani, cioè quel giouin del Contarini, il Barozzo, e il Lauredano, tutti vostri amici, aspettan questa resolutione.

Et il Maggio oltre modo di gratia rispondete, sapendoci dir qualche cosa indirizando le lettere per via di Monsignor di Marlico, che andará benissimo. Veg-gendo M. Emanuele, raccomandatemi a lui, dicendogli che non ho che scriuergli altro se non che ho hauuto le lettere che andauan al Sozini, e che io gli son seruitore. L'Accademia va florida. Et il Lombardo ha fatto il suo principio, a giuditio di ognuno, miracoloso. Altro non occorre, senò che voi insieme con M. Alberto del Bene, e M. Carlo Stanzi, e M. Lorenzo Lenzi, m'amiate e comandiate.

Di Padoua il dì 4 di dicembre 1541.

Alisandro Piccolomini

# THE DATE OF BOILEAU'S *TRAITÉ DU SUBLIME*

By Jules Brody

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

## I

IF we trust to the casualness of Boileau's own account, his translation of the treatise *On the Sublime* took him no time at all: "Je n'ai [. . .] point de regret," he said in the Preface, "d'avoir employé quelques-unes de mes veilles à débrouiller un si excellent ouvrage."<sup>1</sup> Could even an extraordinary Hellenist—Boileau was no more than competent—have made this statement in all earnestness? The merest awareness of the difficulties of that Greek text would make one suspect that those "quelques veilles" were more likely "quelques mois." Boileau, of course, was never averse to self-congratulation; this may partly explain his understatement. One suspects here, however, that the *honnête homme* in Boileau—he wrote at a time when "savant" and "pédant," according to La Bruyère,<sup>2</sup> were synonymous—was discreetly crowding out the scholar in a pose before the public eye.

The editors of the posthumous edition of 1713, alleging Boileau's authority, put the composition of the *Traité du Sublime* in 1674, the year of its publication.<sup>3</sup> And until some twenty-five years ago there was no cause to doubt this. In 1931, however, René Bray made it possible to re-open the question, pointing out that the *Dissertation sur Joconde* (written late in 1664) contains a couple of passages from Longinus, translated, except for a few details, in the very words that Boileau was to use ten years later in the *Traité du Sublime*. This fact alone might have stirred the suspicion that Boileau's "quelques veilles" were perhaps "quelques années." But Bray, who was concerned only with establishing Boileau's authorship of the *Dissertation*, went no farther than to say that the translation proper,

1. Boileau, *Œuvres complètes* [abbr.: OC], ed. Charles-H. Boudhors (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1934-43, 7 vols.), IV, 43. For brevity's sake the volumes referred to will be numbered consecutively according to the date of their first publication:

Vol. I: *Les Satires* (1934)

Vol. II: *Épîtres, Art poétique, Lutrin* (1939)

Vol. III: *Odes, poésies latines, poésies diverses et épigrammes. Prologue d'opéra. Chapelain décoiffé. Pièces attribuées* (1941)

Vol. IV: *Dissertation sur la Joconde. Arrêt burlesque. Traité du Sublime* (1942)

Spelling and, in places, punctuation have been modernized. Unless there is indication to the contrary all italics are my own.

2. *Œuvres*, ed. G. Servois, II, 80.

3. See E. Magne, *Bibliographie générale des œuvres de Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux et de Gilles et Jacques Boileau* (Paris: Giraud-Badin, 1929, 2 vols.), II, 4.

which he placed somewhere between 1670 and 1674, had gone back to re-integrate the fragments quoted in the *Dissertation sur Joconde*.<sup>4</sup>

But could not the reverse have been true? In 1664 could Boileau have been quoting from either a completed manuscript or a draft of the *Traité du Sublime*? Bray had no cause to wonder about this. For he assumed that Boileau knew no earlier text of Longinus than Tanneguy Le Fèvre's reprint (Saumur, 1663) of Gabrielle dalla Pietra's Graeco-Latin edition (Geneva, 1612).<sup>5</sup> From the description we have of Boileau's library, however, the *Longini Rhetorica* he is known to have possessed can be identified unmistakably by its octavo format as this Pietra edition.<sup>6</sup> Bray did not take into account either that Langbaine's reprint of Pietra (Oxford, 1636 and 1638) would also have been accessible to Boileau considerably before 1663. (In the 1674 Preface Boileau mentions having used Langbaine's notes [OC, IV, 43]). It could have been argued, then, even at the time of Bray's article, that Boileau's knowledge of Longinus—and perhaps the translation itself—antedated both Le Fèvre's edition and the *Dissertation sur Joconde*.

It has since become possible to advance at least the first part of this proposition as a certainty. Apropos of one of Le Fèvre's emendations of the Greek text Boileau made this comment: "La restitution de M. Le Fèvre est fort bonne [...] J'en avais fait la remarque *avant lui*."<sup>7</sup> Thus, Boileau's earliest serious interest in *Περί ὕψους*—serious, in that he was already by that time musing over textual minutiae—can be dated from sometime before 1663.

But Charles Boudhors found something disturbing in this comment. "Avant" is found only from 1683 onward: in 1674 Boileau had printed "auparavant lui." This prepositional use of *auparavant*, listed already by Vaugelas in 1647 as archaic, set Boudhors thinking that perhaps not everything in the *Traité du Sublime* was properly the work of Nicolas Boileau.<sup>8</sup> He reasoned that the archaism might more logically have been used by the poet's elder brother, Gilles, a competent Hellenist who had

4. R. Bray, "La Dissertation sur *Joconde*, est-elle de Boileau?" *RHL*, XXXVIII (1931), 337-54, 497-517. On the period of composition of the *Dissertation* see pp. 345-46. The texts involved are OC, IV, 13 and 113 (*Περί ὕψους*, XXXVIII, 4-5). On these see Bray, pp. 512-16.

5. On early editions of Longinus and their seventeenth-century reprints see B. Weinberg, "Translations and Commentaries of Longinus, *On the Sublime*, to 1600: A Bibliography," *Modern Philology*, XLVII (1950), 145-51.

6. See Grouchy, "Testament de Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris*, XXV (1889), 140, No. 280.

7. "Remarque [XLIV]," OC, IV, 210. It was Boudhors (p. 157) who first caught the implications of this statement.

8. Boudhors in OC, IV, 156-58. That "auparavant lui" fell harshly on the contemporary ear there can be no doubt. In a MS list of stylistic criticisms that Pierre-Daniel Huet pasted on the first blank leaf of his copy of Boileau's 1674 edition (BN Rés. Ye 706), the locution is termed a "barbarisme." Huet indicated in the upper left-hand corner of the last leaf that he read the volume between July 28 and August 4, 1674. Cf. Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française*, III, 628.



not only known Longinus before 1663, but had also published translations from the Greek as far back as the early 1650's.<sup>9</sup> But does the mere five-year age difference between Nicolas and Gilles really support this position? Boudhors concedes, moreover, that, although Boileau was generally in accord with Vaugelas, the *Oeuvres diverses* of 1674 contained other proscribed archaisms which were later removed.

Gilles' reputation as a translator helped Boudhors manage another supposed difficulty. In the Preface to the *Traité du Sublime* there stands this estimate of Pietra's Latin version: "Outre que souvent il parle grec en latin, il y a plusieurs endroits où l'on peut dire qu'il n'a pas fort bien entendu son auteur. Ce n'est pas que je veuille accuser un si savant homme d'ignorance, ni établir ma réputation sur les ruines de la sienne. Je sais ce que c'est que de débrouiller le premier un auteur" (OC, IV, 43). Now, argues Boudhors, what ancient writer had Nicolas Boileau been the first to unscramble? Certainly not Horace. But in the mouth of Gilles, who already had to his credit translations of Cebes' *Tabula* (1653) and the *Encheiridion* of Epictetus (1655), these words seemed to make some sense.<sup>10</sup> A glance at the Bibliothèque Nationale catalogue, however, shows that the *Tabula* had been translated into French on three separate occasions before Gilles came on the scene. And there were as many earlier versions of the Epictetus work, the latest of which, by Guillaume Du Vair (1591), was three times reprinted.<sup>11</sup>

Strictly speaking, of course, Nicolas Boileau was not the first translator of *Περὶ ὑψους*; but he was the first to render it into French. It would seem that this is what he meant by the words "débrouiller le premier." (Cf. above, p. 265: "[. . .] débrouiller un si excellent ouvrage"). Although his job was admittedly made easier by the Latin version he had before him, Boileau distinguished meaningfully between the kinds of "débrouillement" he and Pietra had each to perform:

Il est aisé à un traducteur latin de se tirer d'affaire aux endroits même qu'il n'entend pas. Il n'a qu'à traduire le grec mot pour mot, et à débiter des paroles qu'on peut au moins soupçonner d'être intelligibles. En effet, le lecteur, qui bien souvent n'y conçoit rien, s'en prend plutôt à soi-même qu'à l'ignorance du traducteur. Il n'en est pas ainsi des traductions en langue vulgaire. Tout ce que le lecteur n'entend point s'appelle un galimatias, dont le traducteur tout seul est responsable (OC, IV, 43-44).

In this light, "débrouiller" would have more to do with the problem of expressing an author's thought intelligibly in French than with wrestling

9. OC, IV, 156-58.

10. On Gilles' translations see Magne, *Bibliographie générale*, II, 324-28.

11. Boudhors (pp. 156, n. 1, 158) seems aware only of Corrozet's verse translation of Cebes (1543) which he dismisses as not pertinent to Gilles' case. The other two versions are by Geoffroy Tory (1529) and Robert Estienne (1611). Du Vair's Epictetus was reprinted in 1600, 1603, and 1610. His two predecessors were Antoine Du Moulin (1544) and André Rivaudeau (1567).

it from the original. This, moreover, was the sense given the word by André Dacier whose philological notes to Longinus Boileau agreed to print beside his own in the 1683 edition: "De tous les auteurs grecs il n'y en a point de plus difficiles à traduire que les rhéteurs, surtout quand on débrouille le premier leurs ouvrages. Cela n'a pas empêché que M. Despréaux, en nous donnant Longin en français, ne nous ait donné une des plus belles traductions que nous ayons en notre langue" (OC, IV, 185).

It should be said in all fairness that Boudhors had put his proposition tentatively. But when Antoine Adam recently approached this question he was willing to speak of Gilles' "translation" of Longinus as an outright fact:

Ne serait-ce pas qu'après la mort de son aîné, il [Nicolas] s'appropriâ ses manuscrits? [...] Gilles Boileau était mort en 1669. Avant même 1672, on commençait de parler de l'entreprise de Despréaux. Occupés à la traduction de la *Genèse* les gens de Port-Royal louaient Boileau d'avoir fait connaître le traité de Longin et l'hommage rendu par ce rhéteur païen à l'Ancien Testament.<sup>12</sup>

This confrontation of dates, however circumstantial, which for M. Adam clinches the problem, would indeed support his argument if it did not repose on a factual error inherited from Boudhors. For the Port-Royal translation of Genesis to which M. Adam refers appeared not in 1672, as Boudhors had led him to think, but a full ten years later. It is for this reason that Boileau's acknowledgment of the compliment does not figure in his Preface to the translation until 1683: there he speaks gratefully of the learned and pious men "qui [...] ont donné depuis peu la traduction du livre de la Genèse."<sup>13</sup>

Thanks to a chance remark by Michel de Marolles, it is possible once and for all to lay the ghost of Gilles' putative translation, and, more important, to get a clearer notion of the range of years during which Longinus occupied Boileau. In his translation of the *Scriptores historiae Augustae* (1667) Marolles left this brief note concerning a mention by Flavius Vopiscus of the historical "Longinus": "Nous aurons bientôt une fort agréable version de ses œuvres."<sup>14</sup> Marolles no doubt had this information at first hand; he was the personal friend of the Boileau brothers, who both may have attended the weekly sessions of his own learned society and whom he may have seen often in the company of such common friends as La

12. A. Adam, *Histoire de la littérature française au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Vol. III. *L'Apogée du siècle: Boileau. Molière* (Paris: Domat, 1952), p. 149. M. Adam's disposal of Bray's arguments (p. 85) is far from convincing.

13. OC, IV, 46. For Port-Royal's compliment see Le Maître de Sacy's trans. of Genesis (Paris, 1682), "Préface," seconde partie, §iii (BN A 5806). Boudhors (OC, IV, 158, 162, n. 25) either misread a Roman numeral or assumed that the Port-Royal Bible, which did, in fact, start publication in 1672 with the book of Proverbs, had actually begun with Genesis.

14. *L'Histoire Auguste des six auteurs anciens* (Paris, 1667), p. 659 n. The *privilege* is dated June 4, 1666 and the *achevé* July 1, 1667.

Mothe Le Vayer and Guy Patin.<sup>15</sup> As far as Marolles was concerned, the translation of Longinus in question was the one Boileau was to publish in 1674. For in 1678 Marolles took the occasion to acknowledge presentation copies of his *Satires* and "sa version de Longin."<sup>16</sup> Finally, it is nearly inconceivable that in 1667 or shortly before, Boileau should have made known to a common friend the projected publication of a translation based on the notes—which he would have had no right to possess—of a brother from whom at that time he was perhaps estranged.<sup>17</sup>

Of the debt to Gilles only this much may be said: after their father's death in 1657 Nicolas and Gilles stayed on together in the family house until about 1662. During that time Boileau no doubt made use of his brother's library.<sup>18</sup> It is possible that he first read Longinus in Gilles' copy.

Beyond this we know only that in 1667 the translation was well enough along for Marolles to be able to speak of its appearance as imminent. But the matter need not be left here. In 1674 Boileau told the reader of his *Œuvres diverses*: "J'ai fait originairement cette traduction pour m'instruire, plutôt que dans le dessein de la donner au public. Mais j'ai cru qu'on ne serait pas fâché de la voir ici" (*OC*, I, 153). If what Marolles reported in 1667 was not premature—the certainty that portions of Longinus had been translated as early as 1664 supports his story—then one is justified in making Boileau's words of 1674 refer back to what had been true at least seven years earlier: that is to say, that some time before 1667 Boileau had already finished the translation without any thought as yet of publication. In this perspective the picture might be reconstructed thus:

1657-1663: some time between these dates Boileau first came across Longinus.

? -1664: the passages in the *Dissertation sur Joconde* were excerpted from a work already in progress.

1664-1667: if in 1664 the translation was not complete the likelihood is strong that Boileau did finish it before 1667, but without any intention of publication.

? -1667: some time between the completion of the translation and the publication of Marolles' remark Boileau decided to make his Longinus public.

At a certain point, of course, this scheme cannot be maintained without splitting hairs. For it could be argued convincingly that on the basis of the

15. On the relations between the Boileau brothers and Marolles see A. Adam, *Histoire de la littérature française au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, III, 61 ff.

16. "Dénombrement où se trouvent les noms de ceux qui m'ont donné de leurs livres [. . .]" in his *Mémoires*, ed. C.-P. Goujet, III, 242. First printed in his trans. of Ovid (Paris, 1678).

17. On the brothers' falling-out see A. Adam, *Les Premières Satires de Boileau (I-IX): Edition critique et commentaire* (Lille: Bureaux de la Revue d'Histoire de la Philosophie, 1941), p. 152; Boileau's epigram against Gilles (*OC*, III, 37) and Boudhors' note (p. 153). Boudhors sees the rift lasting to 1668. See his remarks in *OC*, I, 347-48.

18. See Sister M. P. Haley, *Racine and the Art poétique of Boileau* (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures, extra volume XII [Baltimore, 1938]), p. 90.

evidence alleged one has no right to state definitively (even in the light of Boileau's "j'ai fait [...] cette traduction") that Marolles' remark refers to a completed version. It is conceivable that Boileau decided to publish the translation when, say, only three-quarters' of the way through. Thus, the final phase of this chronology will claim nothing more than probability. This much, however, emerges with clarity: from some time before 1663 to some time around 1667 Boileau was engaged in studying, and then in translating *Περὶ ὁψους* for his own edification.

## II

From the time of Marolles' indication up to 1674 no reference to Boileau's translation has been uncovered. There is reason to believe, however, that by the end of 1668 it was already circulating in manuscript among Boileau's friends. But the word "friends" here presents problems; for the testimony on which this point must rest comes from one of the "Quatre Amis de Psyché"—a group which, some years ago, scholars were supposed to have definitively scattered.<sup>19</sup> La Fontaine's *Amours de Psyché et Cupidon* (1669) contains a debate on the relative superiority of comedy and tragedy. Ariste is made to explain the matter in these terms:

La tragédie a [...] cela au-dessus de la comédie, que le style dont elle se sert est sublime; et les beautés du sublime, si nous en croyons Longin et la vérité, sont bien plus grandes [I] et ont tout un autre effet que celles du style médiocre. [II] Elles enlèvent l'âme, et se font sentir à tout le monde [III] avec la soudaineté des éclairs. Les traits comiques, tout beaux qu'ils sont, n'ont ni la douceur de ce charme ni sa puissance. Il est de ceci comme d'une beauté excellente et d'une autre qui a des grâces: [I] celle-ci plaît, mais l'autre ravit. Voilà proprement la différence qu'on doit mettre entre la pitié et le rire.<sup>20</sup>

Ariste has adapted to his purpose a distinction which Longinus makes between sublimity and persuasion:

[I] The effect of elevated language [...] is not persuasion but transport (οὐ γὰρ εἰς πειθῶ [...] ἀλλ' εἰς ἐκστασιν ἄγει τὰ ὑπερβυῖα). At every time and in every way imposing speech [...] prevails over that which aims at persuasion and gratification (πάντη [...] τοῦ πιθανοῦ καὶ τοῦ πρὸς χάριν ἀεὶ κρατεῖ τὸ θαυμάσιον). [II] The influences of the sublime [...] reign supreme over every hearer (παντὸς ἐπάνω τοῦ ἀκροωμένου καθίσταται). [III] Sublimity [...] scatters everything before it like a thunderbolt (τὰ [...] πράγματα δίκην σκηπτροῦ πάντα διεφύρηνεν).<sup>21</sup>

19. See J. Demeure, "Les Quatre Amis de Psyché," *Mercur de France*, CCI (January 15, 1928), 331-66; "L'Introuvable Société des quatre amis," *RHL*, XXXVI (1929), 161-80, 321-36. The occasional rigor and, in places, the substance of Demeure's assertions have been shrewdly qualified by A. Adam, "L'Ecole de 1660: Histoire ou légende?" *Revue d'Histoire de la Philosophie*, VII (1939), 215-50.

20. La Fontaine, *Œuvres*, ed. Régner, VIII, 120. The *privilege* is dated May 2, 1668 and the *achevé* January 31, 1669. Bracketed Roman numerals will be used throughout to facilitate the comparison of parallel texts.

21. *Περὶ ὁψους*, I. 4. The English trans. is by W. Rhys Roberts (Cambridge University Press, 1935), p. 43.

La Fontaine was no Hellenist. From what is known of his scholarly capacities he cannot have read this passage in the original.<sup>22</sup> Pietra's translation, then, available to him in the original edition or Le Fèvre's reprint, would have been the likely source:

[I] Non enim ad persuasionem [...] sed ad stuporem rapiunt Grandia. Ac ubique quod probabile est, et ad gratiam comparatum genus orationis [...] semper vincit Admirabile. [II] Grandia [...] quemlibet auditorem superant. [III] Sublimitas omnia, turbinis instar, disturbat.<sup>23</sup>

At first glance one is tempted to find in Pietra's interpolation "ad gratiam comparatum genus orationis" a model for La Fontaine's opposition of the *style sublime* to the *style médiocre*. But since the esthetic of the day, following the ancient divisions, assigned to each literary kind a tone and vocabulary consonant with the mode of affectivity native to it, any generic distinction entailed a necessary stylistic one. Hence, La Fontaine's choice of language here could have been dictated with equal plausibility by the context.<sup>24</sup>

The possibility of any debt to this Latin version fades rapidly, however, before the striking similarities that prove to exist between La Fontaine's allusions to Longinus and the language of Boileau's translation:

[I] Il ne persuade pas proprement, mais il ravit, il transporte [...] qui est tout autre chose que de plaire seulement, ou de persuader. [II] Il donne au discours une certaine vigueur noble, une force invincible qui enlève l'âme de quiconque nous écoute. [III] Quand le sublime vient à éclater [...] il renverse tout comme un foudre. (OC, IV, 50)

La Fontaine's "avec la soudaineté des éclairs" [III] was distilled from "éclater" and "foudre"; the "plaire"-*"ravit"* antithesis [I], with which La Fontaine makes Ariste conclude, harks back to the initial statement in Boileau's rendering. He also follows along with Boileau's unliteral extension of ἐνὶ πᾶσι καθιστῶν, "reign supreme," (Pietra: "superant"), to "enlève l'âme." Finally, Ariste's "tout un autre effet" differentiates with the same emphasis as Boileau's "tout autre chose que de plaire" between

22. Cf. P.-J. d'Olivet, *Histoire de l'Académie Française*, ed. Ch.-L. Livet, II, 303: "Il étudia sous des maîtres de campagne qui ne lui enseignèrent que du latin." On La Fontaine's knowledge of Greek writers see Philip Wadsworth, *Young La Fontaine: A Study of his Artistic Growth in his Early Poetry and First Fables* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1952), pp. 68 ff.

23. I quote from Le Fèvre's reprint (Saumur, 1663), pp. 104-5.

24. Cf. Cicero, *Orator*, XXI. 69: "quot officia oratoris, tot sunt genera dicendi: subtile in probando, modicum in delectando, vehemens in flectendo"; Mairet, "Préface," *Sylvain* (1631), ed. R. Otto, p. 14: "La tragédie décrit en style relevé les actions et les passions des personnes relevées, où la comédie ne parle que des médiocres en style simple et médiocre"; Balzac, *Œuvres* (Paris, 1665, in-fol.), II, 510: "Quand Varron [...] attribue la grandeur à Pacuve et la médiocrité à Térence [...] il veut seulement [...] par ces deux exemples représenter l'idée et la forme de deux genres différents, à savoir de la poésie tragique, et de la comique." Writing in this tradition, Boileau viewed the comic stage as "ennemi des soupçons et des pleurs" and reserved for it a "style humble et doux" (*AP*, III. 401, 409).



enthralment and mere pleasure [I]. These last two interpolations did not enter La Fontaine's text by accident. They can be explained only by supposing that in 1668 he had in his possession or, at least, had access to Boileau's version of Longinus.<sup>25</sup>

### III

There is no sure answer to the question why, if indeed it was complete and circulating in manuscript in 1668, the *Traité du Sublime* did not appear for another six years. There are indications, however, that the delay was not all Boileau's doing. Some time shortly before April 1672 Chapelain used his influence with Colbert to effect the suppression of the seven-year *privilege* accorded Boileau on March 6, 1666 for the publication of his *Satires*.<sup>26</sup> But it is strange that the rage of the author of *La Pucelle* should have taken so long to issue in this decisive retaliatory measure against an enemy of many years' standing. For the most recent and unsparing of Boileau's extant pieces on Chapelain, the *Satire IX*, had appeared in 1668, four years earlier. Indeed, even prior to that time Chapelain, once on his own, in an essay he never signed or published, and often through the pens of other members of the fraternity of Boileau's victims, had done what he could to repay the satirist's thrusts.<sup>27</sup> Accordingly, there is reason to think that Chapelain's *démarche* of 1672, although tributary to an old cause, was fired by a fresh motive. For he could not have failed to know that in 1672 Boileau was reading the *Lutrin* and the *Art poétique*—the latter had been ready since the previous year—all about Paris, and that these new pieces were to be included in a collective edition of his works

25. Does this mean that the early commentators (cf. La Fontaine, *Œuvres*, ed. Régnier, I, xcii-xciii) were right, after all, in identifying Ariste with Boileau? Although his MS could have reached La Fontaine through an intermediary, the probability of direct communication is strong. Demeure had denied any friendship between the two poets (*MerF*, CCI [1928], 355-59) and went so far as to refuse Boileau authorship of the *Dissertation sur Joconde*, a point which Bray has since set straight. A. Adam, in his reply to Demeure (*Revue d'Histoire de la Philosophie*, VII [1939], 231, 240-41), showed that Boileau's acquaintance with La Fontaine was a fact in 1665 and may even have dated from 1663. He also confirmed that Boileau and Racine visited the fabulist at Château-Thierry in 1666 (*Les Premières Satires de Boileau*, p. 173). P. Clarac (*La Fontaine, l'homme et l'œuvre* [Paris: Boivin, 1947], p. 174), while casting doubts on an alleged meeting in 1667 (cf. Boudhors in *OC*, III, 155), admits that Boileau and La Fontaine could well have frequented Lamoignon's gatherings together in that same year. And it is a certainty that in 1671 the two poets were still meeting on good terms. See P. Clarac, "La Fontaine et Port-Royal," *Revue d'Histoire de la Philosophie*, XI (1943), 147-48. Recently, M. Adam was impressed enough with this body of evidence to re-admit the plausibility of the Ariste-Boileau identification, but added that "le problème est décidément insoluble" (*Histoire de la littérature française au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Vol. IV: *L'Apogée du siècle* [Paris: Domat, 1954], p. 71, n.4). Unless La Fontaine's knowledge and use of Boileau's MS can be attributed to accident, there is no longer room for doubt.

26. Chapelain thanked Colbert for this favor in his letter of April 4, 1672 (*Lettres*, ed. Tamizey de Larroque, II, 774-75).

27. On the early Boileau-Chapelain exchange see Magne, *Bibliographie générale*, II, 135-46; G. Collas, *Un Poète protecteur des lettres au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle: Jean Chapelain, 1595-1674* (Paris: Perrin, 1911), pp. 457 ff. Collas (p. 462, n. 6) surely errs, however, in giving 1670 as the date of Boileau's epigram, "Vers en style de Chapelain" (*OC*, III, 36). Boudhors (p. 152) places it in 1667-68.



in which the damaging *Satires* were again to figure.<sup>28</sup> With only political influence to oppose to Boileau's verve, Chapelain this time took the initiative and was able to serve together the causes of vindictiveness and self-protection.

For a while, at least, prevention was the cure. What Chapelain could not anticipate, however, was that his sway with Colbert would very shortly be outweighed by Boileau's credit with Colbert's master. Early in 1674, Boileau's friends at Court won him the opportunity to read before the King. As a result of this audience the poet was granted on February 7, 1674 his first royal pension. On the 28th of the following month he obtained a new *privilege*, valid for ten years, allowing him, finally, to publish "*l'Art poétique*, le *Lutrin* [. . .], *Discours et Epîtres en vers*, la traduction de Longin et de faire réimprimer une seconde fois ses *Satires* dont le *privilege* [était] expiré."<sup>29</sup> Just a few weeks before, on February 22, 1674, Chapelain had passed away.

The *Art poétique*, which was begun no earlier than 1669,<sup>30</sup> was Boileau's next project after the *Traité du Sublime*. It is reasonable to understand that upon completing the former his intention was to publish the two works jointly with the *Lutrin*, the *Satires*, and what *Epîtres* he then had ready. That the translation was withheld expressly for inclusion in these collected works is all the more likely since, when in 1674 the *Œuvres diverses* did appear, the *Traité du Sublime* was placed "à la suite de la Poétique, avec laquelle," Boileau was careful to specify, "ce traité a quelque rapport, et où j'ai même inséré plusieurs préceptes qui en sont tirés ("Au lecteur" [1674], OC, I, 158).

In this light the delay between the completion of the translation in 1668 and its publication in 1674 seems understandable. By 1672 its sister-piece, the *Art poétique*, along with the *Lutrin* and some of the *Epîtres*, were ready to go to press. Had it not been for Chapelain's suppression of Boileau's *privilege* the *Œuvres diverses* might have then come out as planned. With Louis XIV's intervention, the barrier collapsed and the *Traité du Sublime* was launched.

#### IV

It is valuable to know that an essay on the Sublime was the first sustained literary interest of the man whom posterity has hailed (or decried) as the spokesman of Reason. This information will bear out the growing suspicion,

28. It is recorded in the usually suspect *Bolaeana* ([Amsterdam, 1796], pp. 357-58) that in or around the year of Chancellor Pierre Séguier's death (1672) Boileau's publisher, Barbin, appealed without success for a new *privilege*. For reports of private readings of the *Art poétique* see P. Richelet, *La Versification française* (Paris, 1671), p. 13 (achevé: September 24, 1671); Mme de Sévigné, letter of March 9, 1672 (*Lettres*, ed. Monmerqué, II, 524-25). On August 13, 1672 Rapin referred explicitly to Boileau's use of *psalmodier* in *AP*, I, 74 (in Bussy-Rabutin, *Correspondance*, ed. L. Lalanne, II, 147).

29. Magne, *Bibliographie générale*, II, 146. Cf. Ch. Révillout, "La Légende de Boileau," *Revue des Langues Romanes*, XXXVIII (1895), 127.

30. See Boudhors in OC, II, 258.

among those who read him carefully, that the conventional Boileau is not the real Boileau.

Many have been amazed, some have been indignant, that Boileau, of all people, should have been the one to "discover" *Περί ύψους*. But this can no longer be laid to chance. Considering the number of years during which Longinus occupied Boileau, one cannot safely think of the Sublime as something incidental to his critical outlook. There is even cause to question whether what Longinus called "a certain consummate and extraordinary quality in literary style" (I. 3) was not at the very basis of Boileau's esthetic.<sup>31</sup>

For there is an intensity and spiritedness in many of his critical utterances which have never been adequately explained. His judgments were exclusive and dogmatic. He had to be pressed hard to give reasons for his likes and dislikes. Urged on by "la haine d'un sot livre" (*Sat.* IX. 280), with the motto, "Il n'est point de degrés du médiocre au pire" (*AP.* IV. 32) unmistakably sure of what has been called his "sense of rightness,"<sup>32</sup> he took it upon himself to say "de ce qui est mauvais," as La Bruyère so neatly put it, "qu'il est mauvais."<sup>33</sup> But it is essential to see that the vigor and, often, the arbitrariness of his manner—even his not infrequent cavilling and cruelty—are the exteriorization of an impatience with commonness which, in turn, is only the other face of an irrepressible passion for the uncommon. Boileau, basically, was a man who refused to be bored. He demanded of all writers what he found in Racine:

Que tu sais bien, Racine, à l'aide d'un acteur,  
Emouvoir, étonner, ravir un spectateur!

(*Ep.* VII. 1-2)

Was it not, perhaps, this passion that had led him many years earlier to the Sublime—*cet extraordinaire et ce merveilleux qui frappe dans le discours, et qui fait qu'un ouvrage enlève, ravit, transporte* (*OC.* IV, 45)?

Boileau is one of those writers about whom everything appears to have been said. A close examination of his relation to Longinus, however, might reveal that there is a great deal left to be said about him.

31. For attempts to redefine Boileau's esthetic in the light of his attraction to Longinus see J.-E. Fidaio-Justiniani, *Qu'est-ce qu'un classique? Essai d'histoire et de critique positive* (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1930), pp. 224 ff.; E.B.O. Borgerhoff, *The Freedom of French Classicism* (Princeton University Press, 1950), pp. 200-12; A. Scaglione, "Nicola Boileau come fulcro nella fortuna del Sublime," *Convivium* (1950, no. 2), pp. 161-87.

32. The expression is Professor Borgerhoff's (p. 205).

33. *Œuvres*, ed. Servois, II, 461.

## THE FUNCTION OF IRONY IN ROGER MARTIN DU GARD

By Leon S. Roudiez

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

IN his recently published "Souvenirs autobiographiques et littéraires" Roger Martin du Gard has acknowledged his being obsessed with the process of growing old and with the dread of failure.<sup>1</sup> No doubt these two obsessions are very closely related. When, however, one seeks to explain them with the help of biographical and textual information presently available, no easy solution presents itself.

Is Roger Martin du Gard the embodiment of modesty, a man who fully realizes his own limitations—who even underestimates his capabilities—and who fears that old age and death will only too soon expose his unworthiness? Or is he a proud individual, striving for the perfection he feels he can attain, who is mainly afraid he will not have time to show his worth? Those are the questions that immediately suggest themselves and that must be answered if any explanation is to be forthcoming.

But whatever the answer a critic might give to such questions, the mere statement of them implies that Martin du Gard is working under considerable emotional stress. The lengthy account of his endeavors to compose the ambitious work he has entitled "Journal du Colonel de Maumort" gives impressive evidence of that fact.<sup>2</sup> Quite obviously such a heavy strain will be reflected in his published works and communicate itself to the reader. Indeed, when one reads his fictionized accounts of the Dreyfus case and of the outset of World War I, one experiences a much greater sense of participation and assumes a greater share of illusion concerning the lives, struggles and dreams of the main characters than with almost any other contemporary writer. As one reads *Esté 1914*, for instance, and follows the endeavors of Jacques Thibault and his friends in Switzerland, France, Germany, and Belgium, one is suddenly carried away with the fantastic hope that, after all, it is not too late, nothing is hopelessly lost, the war may *not* break out. . . Few books attempting to describe events of such scope are so moving as that volume of *Les Thibault*.

That there is a direct connective between the emotion experienced by the reader and the literary device used by the author to effect his catharsis can readily be seen. What attracts the reader's sympathy and encourages

1. Roger Martin du Gard, *Œuvres complètes*, "Bibliothèque de la Pléiade" (Paris: Gallimard, 1955), I, lii.

2. *Œuvres*, I, xcvi-cxl.

identification is that Martin du Gard's characters do not exhibit the lucidity we find in those of Malraux, for instance. Early in *Les Conquérants* we know that Garine has no hope for any basic improvement in human society; we also know that the revolutionary successes in Canton will bring him no victory; and he knows it too. Likewise, in *La Condition humaine* we learn that Kyo, before the Shanghai uprising, suspects that Chiang Kai-shek will attempt to crush his communist allies after he has captured the city: as a matter of fact it is through Kyo that the reader is first informed of that possibility.

On the contrary, André Mazerelles, Jean Barois, Jacques and Antoine Thibault are never really aware of what is in store for them. An illusion of some sort sustains them to the last. This does not mean, however, that all of Martin du Gard's characters are mere puppets who might be, in the words of Edith Sitwell, "down the endless road to Infinity toss'd." Unlike, say, Pierre Mercadier of Aragon's *Les Voyageurs de l'impériale* they do—especially Jean Barois and Jacques Thibault—tamper with the mechanism of history; while they do not succeed in altering the course of events, they have left their imprint on earth. In short, they are closer to us as human beings than either the over-intellectualized revolutionaries of Malraux or the drifting bourgeois symbol of Aragon.

Indeed, with such lack of total lucidity, Martin du Gard's characters might easily have become twin brothers to Pierre Mercadier were it not for the author's intervention which, as it deprives them of their lucidity, also justifies their ignorance. It is he who, manipulating fate, tricks them, thwarts the realization of their most carefully laid plans, and prevents their hopes from being fulfilled—just as, in his view, fate tricked the 1914 socialists through the unexpected assassination of Jaurès. We are all aware of the fact that unpredictable events can modify the destiny of individuals and even change the course of history. In works of fiction, however, the unexpected and unmotivated catastrophe often leaves the reader unconvinced and annoyed. Martin du Gard, in his major works, has avoided this elementary pitfall and, in the true tragical tradition, has charged fate with irony and often used the very ingredients of which his heroes were made to precipitate their downfall.

It is known that Martin du Gard wrote his first published novel *Devenir!* as an attempt to exorcise his fears:

Cette crainte qui me hantait de manquer ma vie m'a tout à coup sauvé: le désir m'a pris d'écrire l'histoire d'un jeune écrivain présomptueux, sans talent mais plein d'"illusions sur ses capacités," et dont l'existence ne serait qu'une suite de velléités stériles et de déconvenues. (Je m'étais mis en tête que si je réussissais ce portrait d'un "raté" la preuve serait faite que je n'étais pas menacé d'avoir la destinée lamentable de mon héros.)<sup>3</sup>

3. *Œuvres*, I, li.

Whatever happens to the hero, who acts as a foil, cannot possibly happen to his creator; and this is the first form of irony that is encountered in the novel. It amounts to little more than a ritualistic use of verbal irony: the reader must understand that he is not to believe what is written about the main character, i.e. about the author. André Mazerelles is a failure, Jean Barois is discredited, Jacques Thibault's endeavors are frustrated—but such things cannot, must not happen to Martin du Gard.

Two additional forms of irony are then added. The first, which might be called compassionate irony, is directed toward characters embodying ideas with which Martin du Gard is obviously not in sympathy. On the contrary, with characters he is particularly fond of he uses a cruel basically destructive form of irony. (These two varieties of irony are, no doubt, connected with a concern for objectivity, a survival of the author's early training at the Ecole des Chartes. Nevertheless, as will be shown, mere concern for objectivity does not account for the intensity of the irony).

While compassionate irony manifests itself most clearly in *Jean Barois* and *Les Thibault*, there is an intimation of it in the characterization of Marc Fink, in *Devenir!* Fink should be termed a failure by the standards of Mazerelles' (and the author's) literary clan for, ill at ease in the stifling atmosphere of books and theories, he eventually abandons the intellectual life and settles down on a farm (fourteen months on a Louisiana plantation have apparently opened his eyes). But Martin du Gard's disapproval does not prevent the reader from being left with a very favorable impression of Fink.

In *Jean Barois*, the treatment of Barois' mother-in-law, Mme Pasquelin, deserves close attention. She is, when we first meet her, presented in a sympathetic manner although she is described in far from flattering terms. All seems to indicate that she is a kind and considerate mother, a selfless woman active in church organizations who also runs her household most efficiently; she nurses Barois' father during his last illness with exemplary devotion. It is only later that she turns somewhat into a shrew, driving a wedge between her daughter Cécile and Jean Barois, stiffening Cécile's resistance to Jean and to his ideas, rendering their separation inevitable. But then we realize that this unpleasant aspect of her personality is allowed to develop only because she has been severely wounded, through her daughter, by Jean Barois' deceit. Neither woman is aware until after his marriage of his religious doubts (which he carefully and consciously concealed from his fiancée) and his rejection of Catholicism. Cécile, whose religious attitude is rigorous and unsophisticated, is crestfallen when she learns the truth. Mme Pasquelin, who is a kind and considerate woman, brings to bear upon Jean Barois such a weight of destructive hatred that she wrecks his marriage. The irony resides in the fact that this woman, for whose kind Martin du Gard has no special sympathy, has committed no



fault; she is fighting desperately and savagely to protect her daughter against what she sincerely believes to be the worst possible evil, Barois' atheism. The reader is exasperated by her actions, but he also realizes that she cannot, any more than Cécile, understand the position of Jean Barois, that she is not aware of the anguish that accompanied his rejection of Catholicism.

Cécile, too, presents a rather manifest example of Martin du Gard's use of irony. The method of presentation is the same as in the case of Mme Pasquelin; she is introduced in a light somewhat more favorable than is used for her mother, and she is, of course, hurt more directly by her husband's action. Even after her stubborn and exasperatingly tearful argument with Jean, the author directs the reader's resentment not toward Cécile but toward marriage and, to a certain extent, toward women in general. One might also recall that, although it is Cécile who has been harmed, it is she who takes the first step toward reconciliation and who, after their daughter has secluded herself in a convent, cries out to Jean: "Ne me quitte pas, Jean . . . ne me quitte pas . . ."<sup>4</sup>

Mme Pasquelin and Cécile, like the priests who also receive sympathetic treatment, are characters possessing religious beliefs that are not those of the author. Moving into the area of political disagreement, one finds a similar, and perhaps even more unmistakable, handling of the situation. In the first volume of *Esté 1914*, the reader is introduced to Manuel Roy, one of Antoine Thibault's three laboratory assistants. One learns that he has an intelligent face;<sup>5</sup> later, he is alluded to as a nationalist; without any further background information, a political discussion is allowed to develop where Roy expounds a saber-rattling, chauvinistic thesis. He is revealed as a member of the Action Française group and, as one might expect, he advocates a "realistic" approach to the conduct of foreign affairs. He finally states that if war were necessary to the spiritual recovery of France, he would willingly sacrifice his life to that purpose. At this point Martin du Gard intervenes to comment on his obvious sincerity and on the fact that everyone present is aware of that quality. When Antoine and Jacques Thibault are alone, a few moments later, Antoine expresses his fondness for Roy and gives a sympathetic summary of the attitude of a young "maurassien" in 1914. The important point here is that there is no rebuttal. After Antoine has finished, the author adds: "Jacques s'était assis. Il écoutait sans approuver. 'Je préfère les deux autres,' avoua-t-il." There is no other comment. The next time one sees Roy, one receives a definite impression of honesty and candor, and that is what the author intended. Jacques has come to a small afternoon party at his brother's and as he steps into the *salon* he does not see him; it is Roy who comes forward to

4. *Œuvres*, I, 530, and *Jean Barois* (Paris: Gallimard, 1921), p. 471.

5. *Œuvres*, II, 118, and *Les Thibault* (Paris: Gallimard, 1922-1940), VII, 1, 155. Other passages alluded to are in *Œuvres*, II, 295 ff., 301, 302, or *Les Thibault*, VII, II, 120 ff., and 128.



greet him and explain where Antoine is. Then Roy draws Jacques aside for the purpose of having an amiable chat with him. Jacques is more than willing to join him, he is even slightly annoyed when Studler, a man whose political opinions are closer to his own, takes part in the conversation: he feels "hostility" but no "aversion" to the young monarchist. Manuel Roy extolls the virtues of war and the military life; Jacques remains mostly silent. When he does answer he does so in a most courteous manner. The real burden of contradiction rests with Studler who, while he may be saying the right things, has a most unpleasant way of saying them. He seldom just speaks; what he does is expressed by the following verbs: "répéta [...] d'un ton rogue," "ricana," "coupa," "grognâ," "fit entendre une sorte de rire, semblable à un hennissement," "trancha."<sup>6</sup> Studler is definitely the villain of this scene, Jacques has been amazingly considerate, and while Manuel Roy may be considered a fool, he still comes out as a fool in shining armor. Roy takes a brief part in subsequent conversations, but this time as a mouthpiece for certain ideas rather than as a human being, and then he disappears. Martin du Gard, who is anything but an Action Française man, has given us what amounts to a flattering portrait of a political enemy, and that is compassionate irony at its best.

Still more important, perhaps, is the novelist's use of destructive irony, especially as it involves the heroes of his two major works, *Jean Barois* and *Les Thibault*. For, while André Mazerelles is also a victim of Martin du Gard's irony, the downfall of the hero of *Devenir!* is rather gratuitous. There is, for instance, no intrinsic, convincing reason that explains why Denise should die and lose her child the way she does. The author's lack of artistic experience in handling his material prevents the reader from fully appreciating his intent.

One will recall that *Jean Barois* deals with the conflict between science and religion in the latter part of the nineteenth century, as personally experienced by the protagonist of that novel. Jean Barois, the son of a free-thinking doctor and a Catholic mother, has been brought up by a devout grandmother and, at the age of twelve, he fervently believes a pilgrimage to Lourdes will save him from tuberculosis. In spite of these beginnings, he is gradually led to abandon the Catholic faith and embrace atheism for rational, philological reasons. He becomes a leading force in liberal groups and is, of course, deeply involved in the struggle to establish the innocence of Captain Dreyfus. That is the background material out of which the author will draw the ingredients of irony.

Several years later Barois is victim of a traffic accident: the cab he is riding in crashes into a streetcar. Seconds before the impact, an irrational fear of death seizes him and the militant atheist has time to cry out: "Je vous salue, Marie, pleine de grâces . . ."<sup>7</sup> At the hospital, recovering

6. *Œuvres*, II, 338-41, and *Les Thibault*, VII, II, 178-82.

7. *Œuvres*, I, 451, and *Jean Barois*, p. 356.

from his injuries, obsessed with the memory of his weakness in a moment of danger and fearful of what he might do, either under similar circumstances or enfeebled by old age and illness, he makes out a deterministic, atheistic testament. In this document, he repudiates in advance anything he might be induced to say on his deathbed that could be interpreted as a recantation of his atheism: he is, then, lucid enough to foresee the danger. Inevitably, a number of years after the accident, Jean Barois, under the strain of an incurable illness, does return to the Catholic Church and dies assisted by a priest, pressing a crucifix to his lips. The testament is now brought in to give that destructive quality to the author's irony: Cécile finds the document and, without any outward hesitation, burns it; no one will ever know what Barois intended as his definitive statement of beliefs. What makes the novel so moving is the semi-lucidity of the hero. He is aware of his weaknesses as a human being; but neither he nor anyone else could foresee that his wife's action, consistent with her character as it is, would render useless any course that he might take to maintain his intellectual integrity. Barois is thus totally destroyed and even deprived of the respect of his former friends after death.

In *Les Thibault* there are really two protagonists to contend with: Jacques and Antoine. The reader gets acquainted with young Jacques Thibault when the latter is involved in what appears to be a scandalous situation. A supposedly illicit friendship (similar to, and as pure as, the adolescent friendship described by Peyrefitte in *Les Amitiés particulières*) between Daniel de Fontanin and himself is discovered as the two boys run away from home. But reading the letters Jacques writes to his friend, one is struck not only by the intensity of his emotions but by his idealism, his purity, and his sincerity. When, in *La Belle Saison*, Jenny de Fontanin, who has previously taken a dislike to him, begins to suspect that there is more in Jacques than she has given him credit for, it is the purity of his eyes that strikes her.<sup>8</sup> The following day, he and Jenny agree in the condemnation of the life now led by her brother, Daniel, as impure; and the daring gesture that causes a temporary break between them is the following: "Une idée folle traversa son esprit: et, sans vouloir réfléchir, avec cette audace que seuls se permettent les timides, il se pencha vers le mur et baisa l'ombre du visage aimé."<sup>9</sup> A kiss far more pure even than a kiss on the forehead! When they meet again in 1914 and are able to enjoy the brief period of happiness that was to be granted them at last, among the first things he says to her is this: "C'est vous que j'aimais d'un amour fraternel, d'un amour pur. C'est vous que j'aimais comme une sœur . . . Comme une sœur!"<sup>10</sup> As any reader of *Les Thibault* will readily concede, there is no need to dwell on the quality of their love at this point—even though it did be-

8. *Œuvres*, I, 931 and 954; *Les Thibault*, III, I, 241 and III, II, 51.

9. *Œuvres*, I, 966, and *Les Thibault*, III, II, 77.

10. *Œuvres*, II, 322, and *Les Thibault*, VII, II, 157.

come physical. As a matter of fact, one is embarrassed and shocked when Mme de Fontanin fails to see any farther than the act of Jenny's sleeping with a man and blames her for jeopardizing her life in a moment of aberration. The rare mettle of the love between Jacques and Jenny is quite naturally an outgrowth of the idealism of the two young people and is closely related to the altruistic efforts of Jacques as a militant pacifist.

The stage is now set for the ironic blows. At the end of the volume, Jacques leaves for Switzerland to make a final attempt for the cause of peace. With a pacifist friend, a former pilot, he plans to fly over the front lines and drop anti-war leaflets on both French and German troops. A dangerous undertaking, since both sides are apt to try to shoot him down; but, ironically, the engine stalls and the plane crashes before anyone has a chance to shoot at them, before Jacques has a chance to dump a single package of leaflets. Martin du Gard, however, is not satisfied with this form of irony; he does not allow Jacques to die in the crash. The plane has fallen within the French lines and French soldiers have dragged Jacques out of the flaming wreck. Barely conscious, he is placed on a stretcher, his legs in a kind of splint improvised with wood taken from a crate and marked "Fragil" (which will be what the soldiers will call him during the few remaining hours of his life; surely, an incongruous label for such a strong personality!),<sup>11</sup> and carried along by two *gendarmes* who are desperately trying to keep up with the disorderly retreat of the French army. They finally give up, drop Jacques, and one of them angrily finishes him off with his pistol, shouting repeatedly: "Fumier! . . . Fumier! . . . Fumier! . . ." Those are the concluding words of that portion of the novel; those are the words that long reverberate through the reader's mind after he closes the volume and thinks about Jacques. Now, this is certainly destructive irony beyond the call of necessity. One begins to wonder why Martin du Gard should feel the urge to bring the character with whom he has avowedly so much in common to such an ignominious end.

Before that question can be answered, the case of Antoine still needs to be considered. Purity, in its moral connotation, is doubtless not his lot. He is characterized by ambition, energy, strength of will; he knows it and is proud of it. In his day-dreams, while a medical student, he projects himself into the future as a pediatrician of renown and fancies hearing others remark about him: "*Ce bougre-là est doué d'une volonté in-domp-table, [. . .] Persévérante et in-domp-table!*"<sup>12</sup> He also makes this comment on himself: "[. . .] eh bien oui, l'orgueil. Pourquoi non? L'orgueil, c'est mon levier, le levier de toutes mes forces. Je m'en sers. J'ai bien le droit." Antoine is essentially a man of action: "Il ne réfléchissait presque jamais sans com-

11. *Œuvres*, II, 736, and *Les Thibault*, VII, III, 387. There is perhaps a reminiscence of this episode in the third volume of Sartre's *Les Chemins de la liberté*. See *La Mort dans l'âme* (Paris: Gallimard, 1949), pp. 233 ff.

12. *Œuvres*, I, 752 and 754, and *Les Thibault*, II, 168 and 171.

mencer en même temps à agir [ . . . ]."<sup>13</sup> As he acts he senses his power and admires himself. Twice at least, during the emergency operation he performs on a neighborhood girl, he says to himself: "Je suis un type merveilleux."<sup>14</sup> It is he, rather than his brother Jacques, who has inherited the tremendous driving power of the Thibaults, which had permitted his father, Oscar Thibault, to accumulate wealth and honors. The qualities he possesses are what one might call the manly virtues, and they are contained in a strong, healthy body. It seems that he has everything it takes to enable him to surpass the worldly achievements of his father. His career, however, at the moment it appears most promising, is cut short by the war.

According to Martin du Gard's original idea, Antoine was to return from the battlefields alive and able to resume his brilliant activities. Early in 1931, however, the Martin du Gards had a serious automobile accident and were hospitalized for more than two months.<sup>15</sup> It was then that the plan of *Les Thibaults* was completely altered in order to shorten the work—and Antoine's doom was sealed. Was this decision arrived at partly as an effort to "exorcise" fate and ensure, so to speak, that the author would not die in the hospital? Probably only a psychiatrist could tell. At any rate, Antoine, in the final version, will be wounded and he will die a week after the armistice is signed. But no one expects things to be quite so simple: Martin du Gard's destructive irony comes into play. Antoine is wounded a first time, but his health is such that he recovers rapidly and goes back to active service as a medical officer. Now, had he not been cured so fast he might well have survived the war. On a front line inspection, however, he is caught in a gas attack; he is gassed only slightly but his first wound has weakened his lungs to the extent of making the second injury fatal. Furthermore, too sure of himself, he has neglected certain routine precautions that still might have saved him. In this case, Antoine's health and his assurance are being used by Martin du Gard as active agents of his destruction. He has only a few months to live, at the most, and normally this fact would have been kept secret from him. But Antoine has been extremely proud of his own cleverness in being able to fool his patients, to hide from them the nature and the seriousness of their ailments. He will therefore learn the truth about his condition when he visits his old master Philip and sees the famous practitioner go through the deceitful routine he himself knows only too well. Still, Martin du Gard is not finished with Antoine Thibault: he goes after his creation with what almost appears like sadistic joy. Antoine realizes that the energy of the Thibaults, their pride, is directed towards leaving an imprint on this world, towards creating something that will outlast their momentary stay on earth. He also realizes that his premature death will perhaps thwart this desire and consequently

13. *Œuvres*, I, 870 and *Les Thibault*, III, 1, 120.

14. *Œuvres*, I, 871-74, and *Les Thibault*, III, 1, 124-29.

15. See "Souvenirs . . ." in *Œuvres*, I, xciv ff.

he will devote his dying months to an effort to save something for the future. His thoughts will now be for his nephew: early in the war, Jenny had given birth to an illegitimate child, Jean-Paul, the son of Jacques. From his hospital bed, Antoine begins to think, to dream of Jean-Paul, to transfer to the child the hopes he had had for his own future. Jean-Paul is a Thibault and he must carry on in the Thibault tradition and accomplish those things Antoine could not. Antoine decides to keep a diary in which, more and more, he includes thoughts intended for Jean-Paul. He also determines to write to Jenny and propose marriage; This is to be merely a legal formality to make sure that Jean-Paul will always be, officially, recognized as a Thibault, and to establish his own right to direct the boy's future. But Jenny refuses; she wants her son to remain what he is: a bastard—and if that pits him against society, so much the better. Antoine, the would-be successful member of society, dies defeated by Jenny's faithfulness to the memory of Jacques, the man who revolted against society. And yet, the final stroke of the author's irony is yet to come. The heir to the manly virtues of Oscar and Antoine Thibault is now left to grow up in an exclusively feminine atmosphere. He is surrounded by Mme de Fontanin, who is becoming more and more a mystic, Gisele, kind and very feminine, and, of course, Jenny, the idealist. To represent the stronger sex, there seems to be Jenny's brother, Daniel; but he is a man in name only: the shrapnel wound that shattered his thigh has also castrated him . . .

Again one must ask: why does Martin du Gard so relentlessly torment the heroes of his work? Is exorcism through irony sufficient to explain his attitude, or is there indeed, as suggested earlier, an element of sadism in his persecuting of André Mazerelles, Jean Barois, Jacques and Antoine Thibault?

At this point, however, is it not apparent that Martin du Gard is dealing with his characters in a way very similar to the way he deals with himself? Of the two alternatives presented at the beginning of this essay the first must be rejected. He is a great writer and he knows it; he is ambitious and proud of his accomplishments especially as he feels that these are not the manifestations of an inherited gift:

Cette vérité du récit, c'est, je crois, un don naturel: je me sens capable de donner ce degré de vérité à tout ce que je raconte. D'ailleurs, est-ce vraiment un don? C'est par l'application au travail, par la concentration de l'esprit et de l'imagination, c'est à force de me représenter intensément les circonstances et les personnages, que je parviens à "faire vrai."<sup>16</sup>

Speaking of his concept of the novel in dialogue form, he writes:

Je pensais être sur la voie d'une invention féconde, avoir trouvé une "manière" inédite qui devait marquer toute mon œuvre d'un sceau personnel, et—pourquoi non?—ouvrir aux romanciers futurs des possibilités illimitées!<sup>17</sup>

16. *Œuvres*, I, cxxv.

17. *Œuvres*, I, lix.



No less ambitious were his ideas dealing with a new theatrical venture he discussed with Copeau:

[...] cette nouvelle *Commedia dell'arte* que je pensais créer [...] les comédiens choisis pour incarner ces types [...] devaient être exclusivement attachés à leur personnage: c'est à dire seuls détenteurs du rôle, et ne paraissant jamais dans un autre emploi [...]. Je m'étais persuadé qu'ils seraient vite aussi populaires que Polichinelle, Arlequin, don Quichotte ou Monsieur Prudhomme [...].<sup>18</sup>

The original plan of *Les Thibault* and the undertaking of "Les Souvenirs du Colonel de Maumort" can hardly be termed anything if not ambitious. His friend André Gide had clearly seen that aspect of his personality: "Martin du Gard incarne à mes yeux une des plus hautes et nobles formes de l'ambition: celle qu'accompagne un constant effort de se perfectionner soi-même et d'obtenir, d'exiger de soi le plus possible."<sup>19</sup>

There are, of course, witnesses to the "modesty" of Roger Martin du Gard.<sup>20</sup> There is also his own statement concerning the "childish humility" which Paul Desjardins affected in order to conceal his pride:<sup>21</sup> would Martin du Gard make such a comment if he himself were clothing pride with modesty? Perhaps he would not; but that is not really the point. For this so-called modesty is not something *displayed* by the author of *Les Thibault*; it is rather a form of effacement. As Henri Peyre has pointed out, he "has refrained from writing a single preface or a single article on his art and its previous or present practitioners."<sup>22</sup> He has not published his journals or any other form of intimate confessions. He has resisted interviewers. He has sought solitude.

In other words, Martin du Gard has wrought upon himself the same kind of destruction he has meted out to his characters; the same kind of destruction he has imposed upon some of his works: "Marise," *L'Une de nous*, the notes for the first version of *Les Thibault*, and perhaps even "Maumort."<sup>23</sup> In this instance, it seems, modesty could well represent little more than a manifestation of pride. Such an aspect of what psychologists call reaction-formation is not an infrequent phenomenon, the most common occurrences of which may be found in religious circles where extreme humility can coincide with an ineradicable self-esteem. (Among literary manifestations of this situation one might mention the case of Alissa in Gide's *La Porte étroite* or of Rogozhin in Dostoevski's *Idiot*). As a matter of fact, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that Martin du Gard

18. *Œuvres*, I, lxxvi.

19. André Gide, *Journal*, 1er janvier 1922.

20. Albert Camus, "Roger Martin du Gard," the preface to *Œuvres* which may also be found in the October 1955 issue of the *NNRF*, and Henri Peyre, *The Contemporary French Novel*, p. 39.

21. *Œuvres*, I, lxxxvii.

22. Peyre, *loc. cit.*

23. In this connection see also Justin O'Brien, "Families, I Hate You," *Saturday Review of Literature*, March 25, 1939.



entered literature as others have gone into religion. His literary habits often tend to approximate a monastic ritual, his general attitude and aloofness from the routine bustle of the literary brotherhood bear a striking resemblance to that of a high priest.

It would be difficult to deny that the author has put a great deal of himself in the principal characters of his novels. André Mazerelles, Jean Barois, Jacques Thibault, Antoine Thibault, all are destroyed, as has been shown, misunderstood or ignored by their contemporaries, frustrated in their main ambitions, wounded exactly where it would hurt their creator the most. It is difficult to believe that this is mere coincidence. Thus, one could perhaps conclude that what appeared to be analogous to sadism is actually much closer to masochism.<sup>24</sup> In addition to suffering brought upon himself, there could be a secondary outlet for the probably unconscious masochism of the writer—if one can be made to suffer vicariously, so to speak. Let him extract vital elements of his own being and embody them in a literary creation, let him give life to the protagonists of his novels, molded, in large part, after his own image: he can now, by proxy, torture himself and his fondest dreams; he can martyrize his characters to his heart's content and watch them be destroyed by an ironic twist of fate, of his own making. Likewise, he could experience painful pleasure in endowing the representation of his opponents with qualities, or giving them excuses, that will make them likeable and appealing to the reader.

One indication that Martin du Gard has been too proud and ambitious (and that he is now aware of it) can be found in this extract from his "Souvenirs":

Le moment où un écrivain vieillissant prend conscience que ses ambitions ont été démesurément supérieures à ses possibilités, est un événement intérieur dramatique,—et un peu ridicule. La blessure de cette irréremédiable déception, je la porte en moi, depuis deux ans peut-être; à coup sûr depuis un an.<sup>25</sup>

Time and his obsession have both caught up with him and it is too late, he believes, to reach the perfection he has been seeking.

But the man who grows old, feels that he has failed (how many men can honestly look back upon their life and call it a success?), and lacks the consideration of younger generations often has his revenge—or so Martin du Gard would have us think. Two of his minor works, the plays *Le Testament du Père Leleu* and *La Gonfle*, present the case of older men who turn the tables on those who sought to trick them. In the second of these comedies, Andoche, while not exactly old (he is in his fifties), is nevertheless pitted against a younger man in his thirties who intends to use him for his own purposes. As the play ends, however, Andoche, who refers to himself

24. It should be apparent that the words "sadism" and "masochism" are used without any of their possible sexual implications. Many modern psychologists seem, happily, to be veering away from the Freudian over-emphasis on sexual motivation.

25. *Oeuvres*, I, cxix-cxx.

as "un vieux gagois, un'vieill'tête ed'bedaud,"<sup>26</sup> has everything his own way. In *Le Testament du Père Leleu*, the servant Torine has poisoned Alexandre's mind against Leleu hoping he would make his will in her favor. He does not, however, and when she thinks she has persuaded Leleu to impersonate a dying Alexandre and make the will the way she wants it, he fools her and has the notary make Alexandre's will in his own favor (as Alexandre intended to in the first place).

Likewise, the author need not fear old age; he will either have the last word or posterity will vindicate him. Significantly, in these plays, he tells his story straight and the right man wins in the end: that is the tradition of comedy. Irony is reserved for more serious works—tragic works—where its function would seem to be twofold. It is first a means of exorcising fate, and second an expression of the transference of the author's masochism to his characters—in itself a reaction to his inherent ambition and pride.

26. *Œuvres*, II, 1235.

## REVIEWS

*Le Dieu caché: Etude sur la vision tragique dans les Pensées de Pascal et dans le théâtre de Racine.* Par L. Goldmann. Paris: Gallimard, 1955. Pp. 454.

The title of Lucien Goldmann's impressive study suggests the dominating person of the book: the God who is always present but at the same time always absent, who is spoken to but who never answers, who observes man's actions without ever intervening. It is for this God that the tragic man lives exclusively, in a world which no longer has any meaning for him. For the tragic man has recognised the paradox of the world, its ambiguities and its compromises, and he has become converted to an essential existence; so he demands absolute truth and he demands that the world's contrarities be synthesised. He makes these demands knowing his own limits, the limits of the world and the unbridgeable gulf that separates him from God as well as from the world.

Of the existence of this God the tragic man has no theoretical certainty: he can only make a practical bet on it. The consequences of this attitude are the primacy of the moral over the theoretical and the efficacious, the abandonment of all hope of material victory or simply of a future, with nevertheless the safeguard of spiritual and moral victory, the safeguard of eternity.

This, according to Mr. Goldmann, is the tragic consciousness, and it is in the light of this vision of the world that he studies Pascal, Racine, Jansenism, and the French seventeenth century.

The tragic vision is essentially dialectical. This book is based to a great extent upon the work of the early George Lukács who is perhaps the master of Marxist literary criticism. Goldmann consequently sees Pascal as the first truly modern man and the *Pensées* as the first significant and coherent expression of dialectical thought. Pascal to be sure represents a first and *tragic* phase (represented also by Racine and Kant) which was a necessary step toward the later dialectical idealism and dialectical materialism so inescapably a part of the modern psyche. Individualistic rationalism and empiricism were strong in the first half of the seventeenth century. Against them Pascal opposed an Augustinianism which, while absorbing them, pushed beyond them in search of a *totality* (the principle and goal of dialectical thinking) wherein faith would supersede reason as the essential human trait. With Pascal of course this faith was in an unprovable God; later it was to be in the human community and in the future.

The line then runs from Pascal and Racine through Kant, Hegel and Goethe to Marx and Lukács. An odd assortment, but the non-French thinkers are illuminating as they are brought in for comparison and contrast, and great care is taken not to claim too much. Perhaps the most significant difference between the tragic phase and the later phases of dia-

lectical thought was the introduction of history and the consequent possibility of an improvement in the human lot. For the tragic thinker no such possibility exists; for him in a sense time does not exist: only the present exists. Tragic dialectic is static.

This is the position of extreme Jansenism, but not all Jansenists held it. Mr. Goldmann sees at least three distinct attitudes taken by various members of the group, with corresponding theological, philosophical and political views. There was a moderate, even Cartesian position, represented by Arnauld and Nicole, in which the power of human reason was proclaimed along with the necessity of living in the world and of fighting for the good even without hope of any radical change. Then there was the extreme tragic position held by Barcos, Abbot of Saint-Cyran. It consisted in a complete repudiation of reason and in a unilateral refusal of the world with all its shifting values in favor of an absolute truth one could hope (without the slightest certainty) *eventually* to possess only by withdrawing from the world completely. Thus the *solitaires*. Finally there is the position expressed in the *Pensées*. It seems at first glance intermediate but it is in reality the most extreme of the three, for it refuses the world as absolutely as did Barcos while accepting nonetheless to stay in the world and to employ reason to the fullest extent possible even though it recognises the poverty of that reason. At the same time it continues to reject all relativity; it still demands the absolute truth, in the interest of totality, in an all or nothing bet. In this situation, which for Pascal is the real human situation, one accepts the *absolutely* paradoxical condition of certainty *and* doubt, optimism *and* fear, grandeur *and* misery, hope *and* anxiety.

So Mr. Goldmann examines in detail and with much quotation the text of the *Pensées*, assessing the views of other students of Pascal as he goes along and bringing into his own perspective Pascal's life, the general (formless) form of the work, Pascal's thoughts on man and nature, his epistemology, his ethics and his esthetics, his views on society and justice, the *pari* (which is seen as key and center of the apology), and finally a summary description of the Christian religion as Pascal believed it—a religion by its very contradictoriness and paradox uniquely true.

This gives only the most general indication of the richness of Mr. Goldmann's work. It should be stressed that, if he is in the tradition of dialectical materialism, the dialectic interests him more than the materialism. There are, however, two interesting chapters on the social and intellectual background of Jansenism suggesting tentatively but persuasively that the movement spread among the *noblesse de robe* in the first half of the seventeenth century along with a growing coolness toward social life and toward the central power—a coolness not unrelated, it would seem, to certain difficulties in connection with efforts to follow careers.

Turning to Racine, Mr. Goldmann again applies his Lukács-inspired dialectic. He sees Racine as unquestionably expressive of Jansenism even

unto its differing emphases. *Andromaque*, *Britannicus* and *Bérénice* are *tragédies du refus*, reflecting approximately the position of Barcos; *Bajazet*, *Mithridate* and *Iphigénie* are not tragedies but *dramas intramondains* and reflect the hope of Arnauld, the effort at reconciliation with the world, while *Phèdre* comes closest to Pascal as we shall see.

The general and ideal theme then is the relationship between the individual, the world, and the mute hidden God. Some individuals are vouchsafed a clear and univocal consciousness out of which they act and talk in terms of absolute values to which they adhere in the face of all the possibilities of compromise and confusion offered them by the world. These are people like *Andromaque*, *Junie*, *Bérénice* and, in the end, *Phèdre*. They are the only truly tragic characters according to this view. They play out their lives in the silent sight of the hidden God, fixed in the acceptance of their lonely paradox, unwilling to sacrifice a moral for a material victory, ready to renounce the world and to enter a divine universe. The others, the Orestes and the Agamemnons, the worldly people, flounder in their relativity, unable to choose, merely pathetic or at best dramatic.

As the foregoing suggests, there is dialectical progression in the works of Racine, and there is coherence: from *Andromaque* on, the plays follow through and foretell. If, for instance, *Andromaque's* willingness finally to play the game of the world by pretending to accept Pyrrhus' bargain keeps her from attaining ideal tragic stature, still her conflict with the world points the way to the fullness of *Britannicus*. But *Bérénice* moves beyond these two earlier plays, for their real central character is not an individual but the world, and they were written from the point of view of the conflict between the individual and the world, whereas *Bérénice* was written from the point of view of the tragic characters Titus and *Bérénice*, who have become the central characters and who can no longer communicate with the world: Antiochus is never listened to. Even so, *Andromaque*, *Britannicus* and *Bérénice* make up a cycle of "tragédies sans péripétie ni reconnaissance" to which Racine never returns: the rest of the "pièces" from *Bajazet* through *Phèdre* make use of these parts of traditional tragedy although *Phèdre* is the only true tragedy among them. Last of course come the Biblical plays, but the culmination of the *œuvre* in Mr. Goldmann's opinion is, not surprisingly, *Phèdre*. It sums up the career, for if the first three plays (beginning with *Andromaque*) dramatised the impossibility of compromise, and if the next three suggested the possibility of living in the world, *Phèdre* plays the paradox of both positions: "*Phèdre* est la tragédie de l'espoir de vivre dans le monde sans concession, sans choix et sans compromis, et de la reconnaissance du caractère nécessairement illusoire de cet espoir" (p. 421).

*Esther* and *Athalie* do not really come within the domain of Mr. Goldmann's study because, as he says, these are plays about a present and manifest God and not about a hidden God. They are also about a religion

triumphant in the world and as such they are not a reflection of the Jansenist experience. Finally the use of the chorus expresses a sympathy between individual and community utterly at variance with Mr. Goldmann's idea of tragedy.

To a great extent this book is a justification of its method, for despite numerous debatable points (with respect to both method and conclusions) it is one of the most extended and illuminating studies of French baroque sensibility to appear in some time. It is not easy to read: its thought is complex and its execution involves considerable repetition. Mr. Goldmann is aware of this but goes ahead with it, consistent with his method as explained. Those who are impatient with paradox and circular analysis (back and forth between part and whole) may well find it more than they can tolerate, but for some surely it will prove a turning point in their experience of the French seventeenth century.

Princeton University

E. B. O. BORGERHOFF

*Le Crime et la peine dans l'œuvre de Victor Hugo.* Par P. Savey-Casard. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1956. Pp. 424.

*Victor Hugo: Claude Gueux.* Edition critique présentée par P. Savey-Casard. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1956. Pp. 144.

It is not surprising that as a young man Victor Hugo felt the compulsive interest of crime, for it was, after all, an interest shared by the devotees of the *roman frénétique*. What is remarkable is the maintenance of this interest throughout his life, the intensification of his study of the criminal, and the continual deepening and broadening of his understanding of the subject. But even his first awakening to the life and death of the criminal was something more than the mere titillation of intellectual curiosity; the vision of horror he experienced when, as a boy of nine, he met an executioner's procession in Burgos—the victim unmanned with fear, the procession escorted by the spectral figures of Penitents—was forever stamped on his mind. "Ce qui était vision dans le cerveau de l'enfant devient syllogisme dans le cerveau de l'homme." By 1823, in fact, he was already preaching the abolition of the death penalty in *Han d'Islande*.

It is one of the merits of M. Savey-Casard's thesis (he is Professor at the Facultés Catholiques de Lyon) that the development of Hugo's awareness of the problem is made abundantly plain. Hugo remained fascinated by the spectacle of the guillotine; he had accidentally met Louvel, the murderer of the Duc de Berry, on his way to the scaffold, and in 1825 he went out of his way to observe the execution of Jean Martin. But his attention gradually spread to the whole question of crime, its causes and the proper treatment of the criminal. Early and crude though it is, *Han d'Islande* stands by itself: it is Hugo's sole attempt to depict the criminal as conditioned by his heredity and psychology; it was an attempt which he knew had failed and he made no more essays in the *bête humaine*. The



way his mind was turning is apparent in *Le Dernier Jour d'un condamné*, for there we get the first indication that the misdemeanors of a man like Le Friauche are not entirely his own responsibility but that part, at least, of the blame must be transferred to society. The explanation is shifted from the domain of individual psychology to that of social environment. While still engaged on this book, Hugo was able to read the trial of Claude Gueux in the *Gazette des Tribunaux*, and the impassioned outbursts of the accused man seemed to corroborate and confirm the conclusions he himself had already tentatively reached. It seems that *Claude Gueux*, which forms the subject of M. Savey-Casard's complementary thesis, was originally intended as a brief factual example to reinforce the argument for penal reform; but that between 1832 (the date of the first sketch) and June 1834 (when the text was written in its present form) Hugo decided to turn it into a story that could stand by itself. M. Savey-Casard has utilized all the resources of scholarship to illuminate the text; it is hard, perhaps impossible, to think of any useful source of information that he has not consulted, whether it is the surviving administrative archives on the case, the details published in the local press, or Hugo's MS in the Bibliothèque Nationale; in fact, the job could scarcely be better done. But necessary and admirable though it is, does it much alter our impression of the book? Probably not, for M. Savey-Casard's conclusion does not differ substantially from those expressed long ago by Louis Ulbach and E. Biré. Thanks to his erudition, however, we can now follow in detail the distortions that make *Claude Gueux* more a political pamphlet than a serious work of art. The whole writing of the book was an exercise in the use of whitewash. The real Claude Gueux was a tramp and habitual thief; but Hugo turns him into a Parisian, obliterates his criminal record and gives him a wife and child. The real Claude Gueux was foul-mouthed and prodigal of threats and violence; and of this Hugo gives no hint. Above all, Claude becomes much older, and his friend Albin Legrand a little younger, so that the real relationship between the two men, which was almost certainly a crude and sensual one, can be presented as that between father and son. Beside this, even the character-defamation of poor Delacelle, Claude's jailor and victim, must seem a trivial piece of deceit.

It is customary to point to *Claude Gueux* as a dim foreshadowing of *Les Misérables*; and of course the suggestion is a fruitful one. Claude himself must remind the reader of Jean Valjean, and there are obvious points of resemblance between Delacelle and Javert. But it can only be fruitful if the differences are also borne in mind, for *Claude Gueux* has neither the upsurging optimism of *Les Misérables* nor its basically religious standard of judgement. The evolution in Hugo's thought by which this change was to take place is the heart of M. Savey-Casard's subject, and very skilfully he pursues it. His book, extensive and ponderous though it is, is a model of lucid exposition and careful scholarship. The net is cast wide: he gives

us not only a shrewd and penetrating analysis of Hugo's ideas but the whole complex background of contemporary thought on crime, and some fascinating sidelights on social conditions, particularly the state of the prisons. It is all the more regrettable that a book so obviously suitable as a work tool should not possess an index.

The penal reforms that Hugo proposed are as precise as his social criticisms are vague; but it is his general ideas that deserve particular attention, for out of Hugo's metaphysical beliefs—his conception of evil, his attitude to the freedom of the will—his particular proposals emerge and crystallize. What, he asks, is the source of justice? Until his break with the right in 1850 he was unable to give a satisfactory answer to this question; but once he had ceased, under the pressure of political realignment, to identify the function of justice with the defense of a particular situation of society, he was free to develop his crucial distinction between *justice*, which is divine and infallible, and *droit*, which is human and subject to the grossest forms of error. There are two consequences of this view, one touching the nature of justice, the other touching the nature of law. If justice is divine and emerges from God, its essence consists of truth, beauty and love; there is no room in it for cruelty or revenge; and Hugo concludes, after a long struggle with himself, that true justice must be identical with pity and that eventually the whole penal system will only survive, if it survives at all, in the form of moral suasion. It is a noble conclusion, but one that can only be reached by a virtual sacrifice of the belief in free will; for if the criminal is free and chooses crime, he must deserve judgment as well as pity. As to the law, if it is deprived of its proper foundation on justice, it can have no real force; indeed the law itself may be a crime, and for a shining example of that Hugo would point to the legalization of Louis Napoleon's seizure of power. Is it then right to flout an evil law? Hugo hesitates. He is clear that moral rebellion against social injustice cannot be classified as in any sense a *délit*; but what about physical rebellion? Insurrection offends his absolute principles of non-resistance to evil, but appeals to his political prejudice; and eventually the latter wins, but not overwhelmingly, for the spectacle of the Commune roused his deepest misgiving and to the end he was preaching the immorality of violence.

M. Savy-Casard's survey brings out clearly the instability or rather the ambivalence of Hugo's judgments; he would condemn in society what he would condone in a criminal. But it was the ambivalent attitude of a whole generation who grew indignant at capital punishment but readily excused political assassination. Hugo lacks indeed a clear head and a cool temper. One can argue that his observation is impeded by his fondness for such literary devices as antithesis and symbol; that his fervor as a social reformer leads him to overlook the physiological causes of crime; that he misrepresents the political criminal; and that his huge optimism causes him not only to blur the problem of evil but to assimilate it too closely to

the problem of crime, so that his hope of a final expiation of all sin betrays him into a highly abstract and theoretical technique for dealing with the law-breaker. It seems unlikely that the criminologist will be able to quarry much that is new from Hugo's work. M. Savey-Casard observes—and evidently regrets, for he describes it with concealed value-judgment words like *déséquilibre*—a movement away from the observation of reality and towards abstraction and prophecy, which begins in the 1850's and accelerates after 1862<sup>1</sup>; but at least it is a movement that will culminate in the grandiose lines of *Dieu* and *La Fin de Satan*. And from the whole survey Hugo emerges with enhanced credit. Only an extended study of this kind can show the deep earnestness of his lifelong concern with the criminal and the ultimate dependence of his social recommendations on his belief in an active, world-ordering Providence; no one can surpass his insight into the operations of conscience; and thanks to M. Savey-Casard we can discern more clearly in his work what we can recognise also in writers as different as George Eliot, Tolstoy and Meredith—a moral extension of character that is otherwise so curiously and conspicuously absent from the French novelists of the nineteenth century.

*St. Catherine's Society, Oxford*

PHILIP SPENCER

1. This is not the whole truth, for Hugo was also becoming more realistic, in the technical sense, for part of this time at least. See Olin H. Moore, "Realism in *Les Misérables*," *PMLA*, LXI (1946), 211-28.

## REVIEWS IN BRIEF

*Floire et Blancheflor*. Nouvelle édition, revue, corrigée, et augmentée. Ed. Margaret M. Pelan. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, Textes d'Etudes, 7.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956. Pp. xxix + 194. The years 1937-38 saw no fewer than three editions of *Floire et Blancheflor*: Miss Pelan's first edition (1937), one by Wilhelmine Wirtz (*Frankfurter Quellen und Forschungen zur germ. und rom. Philologie*, XV, 1937), and another by Felicitas Krüger (*Romanische Studien*, XLV, 1938). The critics' reception of all three may be judged by H. Gelzer's comment (*ZRP*, LXIV, p. 182): "Die Aufgabe war eben für alle drei Damen einfach zu schwer," and by E. B. Place's characterization (Cabeen's *Critical Bibliography*, I, no. 902) of Du Méril's 1856 edition as "still best." Unfortunately the appearance of Miss Pelan's revised edition does not change the situation: in fact her new edition seems to me even less satisfactory than the previous one.

Miss Pelan remains faithful to her choice of *B* (Paris, Nat., f. nr. 1447) as basis of her text despite the disapproval of most of the critics. In this I am inclined to think she is right, although *A* (Paris, Nat., f. fr. 375) could serve almost equally well. She makes no attempt to determine the relationship of the MSS other than to state that *C* (Paris, Nat., f. fr. 12562) is a copy of *A*. Apparently she considers the classification of MSS as useful only to the editor of a Lachmann style composite text.

It does not seem to have occurred to Miss Pelan to consider whether a rather long passage present in *A* but absent from *B*—the magician and lion pit incidents—was originally part of the poem. She merely remarks in passing that for her it is "du pur remplissage." On esthetic grounds I would agree with her that the poem is better without this passage, but that has nothing to do with the question whether it was written by the poet or interpolated. If one accepts either the classification of the manuscripts proposed by Gamillscheg in his masterly review of Miss Pelan's earlier effort (*ZFSL*, LXII, p. 441) or that of Miss Krüger in her edition, one has grounds for concluding that the passage is an interpolation; for neither *B* nor the Palatine fragment *V*—independent of each other in both classifications—has it. On the other hand, the lion pit incident shows up in the so-called popular version (*D* = Paris, Nat., f. fr. 19152). One may, of course, suppose that the author of this later version drew his matter from a MS of the *A* family. But again one may wonder why a copyist would have been led to make such an interpolation. If his purpose was to lengthen the romance, why did he confine himself to this one instance? It should be remarked too that the passage gives evidence of considerable imagination and is of the same cloth as the rest of the romance.

The first edition's woefully inadequate discussions of the author's language and versification have been omitted from the present introduction. A brief treatment of the morphological and phonological features of *B* remains, but is insufficiently developed to be of any great service. Nothing new is contributed on the literary side.

Unquestionably the most unsatisfactory feature of the edition is the critical apparatus. Doubtless the publishers rather than Miss Pelan are to be blamed for the disposition of this following the text rather than below it. In any case let me loudly

affirm that such an arrangement, except when the critical material is of very limited extent, is an abomination not sufficiently justified by the economy realized. The unintelligent practice of abbreviating two-letter words also slows down the user of the apparatus and to no purpose, for the space, if any, gained thereby is negligible. But worst of all is the presence among the variants of frequent ambiguities induced for the most part by a system of presentation which invites inconsistencies.

Here are some observations on the text: 52 The first edition's correction, *cent* for *sept*, should be retained.—177 Read *la ravie* for *l'Aravie*. Blancheflor's mother is obviously meant here and not the wet nurse mentioned in vv. 181–82, which are parenthetical.—187 *B*'s reading, *li*, should be retained; the reference of the pronoun is to *Floire* alone, as the following verse makes clear.—314 *B*'s reading is unsatisfactory for the rime. *V*'s reading seems likely to be closest to the original.—441 *B*'s reading makes little sense. Why would a Count be supposed to have extraordinary—indeed any—skill as an artisan? *ACP*'s reading, *Vulcans*, is unquestionably the correct one.—482 Suppress semi-colon and enclose following verse in parentheses.—683–86 Replace comma after *est* in 683 by period. Suppress parentheses in 684 and 686. Place colon at end of 685. Put quotation marks around 686 and question mark after *Blancheflors*.—726 Suppress period.—751 *ne tendras* should probably be read *n'entendras*.—856 *Oi nous* is curious, but is the correct reading (Miss Krüger gives *or nous* in her variants). Monosyllabic *oi* does not represent *hoc ille*, but simply *hoc*. *Oi nous* would thus parallel the common forms *o je* and *oie < hoc ego*.—973 I should prefer *soz l'oreille* to Miss Pelan's conjecture.—1271 Suppress period.—1319 Replace comma by period.—1399 Suppress comma.—1443 Read *li* for *il*.—1452 *cel* as a neuter pronoun at the time of the poem's composition would be surprising. The same observation applies to *cest* in 1834.—1557 The non-elision of the final *e* of *Dame* renders *B*'s reading for this verse suspect. The same applies to 2020, where a similar unusual hiatus, not present in *A*, is found.—2048 Place period after *Blancheflor*.—2436 Read *neu* (*ne + le*) for *n'en*.—2470 Read *nel* for *ne*. (V. FREDERIC KOENIG, *State Teachers College, Edinboro, Pennsylvania*)

*The Classics and Renaissance Thought*. By Paul Oskar Kristeller. (The Martin Classical Lectures, vol. 15.) Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, for Oberlin College, 1955. Pp. 106. Prospective readers should not be misled by the smallness of this book; it is an important publication. Professor Kristeller's knowledge of the corpus of renaissance texts is extensive, detailed, and accurate; he has previously used it for specialized studies or the definition of a given philosopher's work such as his authoritative treatment of Ficino. The invitation to deliver the Martin Classical Lectures at Oberlin College provided a happy stimulus to the formulation and expression of certain broader concepts about the chief currents of renaissance thought. Two aspects of the book are striking: it is so clearly and simply written that it should become a students' companion to renaissance studies; its rectifications and precisions of prevailing notions should affect the work of specialists.

From a scholarly point of view, much of the originality and value of Kristeller's statements comes from the fact that they are not based upon the restricted number of texts which scholars have chanced to publish but "rather try to draw a cultural map of the period, taking into account the vast amount of information hidden away in the bibliographies of early editions, in the collections and catalogues of manuscript books, and in the records of schools, universities, and other learned



institutions" (p. 5). The first lecture, "The Humanist Movement," fruitfully applies the notion of professional interest and institutional status to the various branches of study prominent between 1300 and 1600 and, after a far from perfunctory consideration of the rivalry between rhetoricians and philosophers in the classical, medieval, and renaissance periods, concludes (p. 10):

Thus Renaissance humanism was not as such a philosophical tendency or system, but rather a cultural and educational program which emphasized and developed an important but limited area of studies. This area had for its center a group of subjects that was concerned essentially neither with the classics nor with philosophy but might be roughly described as literature. It was to this peculiar literary preoccupation that the very intensive and extensive study which the humanists devoted to the Greek and especially to the Latin classics owed its peculiar character, which differentiates it from that of modern classical scholars since the second half of the eighteenth century. Moreover, the *studia humanitatis* includes one philosophical discipline, that is, morals, but it excludes by definition such fields as logic, natural philosophy, and metaphysics, as well as mathematics and astronomy, medicine, law, and theology, to mention only such fields as had a firmly established place in the university curriculum and in the classification schemes of the period. This stubborn fact seems to me to provide irrefutable evidence against the repeated attempts to identify Renaissance humanism with the philosophy, the science, or the learning of the period as a whole.

The remainder of the chapter deals with the activities of the humanists and is particularly valuable for its nice discrimination of what the several humanists did and in what relation their activities stood to particular classical texts.

The second lecture, "The Aristotelian Tradition," opens with a detailed consideration of the manner in which Aristotle's writings were transmitted to the medieval scholars, distinguishes the three lines of transmission during the medieval period: Byzantine, Arabic, and Latin, and the differing traditions inherited therefrom by the renaissance, and shows that Aristotelianism "continued strongly and vigorously to the end of the sixteenth century and even later" (p. 34). The central portion of the chapter treats the development of Aristotelianism in the renaissance period and the nature of the diverse attacks upon it. "Aristotelian natural philosophy, rich in subject matter and solid in concepts, could not possibly be displaced from the university curriculum as long as there was no comparable body of teachable doctrine that could have taken its place. This was not supplied by the humanists, the Platonists, or the natural philosophers of the later Renaissance, who could dent but not break the Aristotelian tradition. The decisive attack upon the natural philosophy of the Aristotelians came from Galileo and the other physicists of the seventeenth century" (p. 44). The third lecture, "Renaissance Platonism," contains an able disentangling of

the puzzling fact that different Platonists have selected, emphasized, and developed different doctrines or passages from Plato's works. Hardly a single notion which we associate with Plato has been held by all Platonists, neither the transcendent existence of universal forms nor the direct knowledge of these intelligible entities, neither spiritual love nor the immortality of the soul, let alone his outline of the perfect state. Thus it is possible for two thinkers who have been conventionally and perhaps legitimately classified as Platonists to have very different philosophies, or even to have not a single specific doctrine in common [. . .] Moreover, ever since classical antiquity, Platonist philosophers have tried not so much to repeat or restate Plato's doctrines in their original form, as to combine them with notions of diverse origin, and these accretions, like the tributaries of a broadening river, become integral parts of the continuing tradition (p. 48).



Here as elsewhere, Kristeller does signal service in identifying the precise ideas of the named tradition which enter into play in precisely specified renaissance works, thereby dispelling the vagueness and inaccuracy attendant upon discussion of "platonism," "humanism," and such fictitious entities *en bloc*. The three lines of medieval transmission are again distinguished, and the novelty of renaissance Platonism assayed. Professor Kristeller's long study of the Florentine Platonists makes him a particularly reliable guide in this difficult and complex area. The relation of Platonism to humanism is well worked out (see especially p. 58) and its value to the new scientists seeking to replace the qualitative Aristotelian physics by a quantitative physics is made evident (pp. 65-68). These pages are of especial interest because of the current attempt by scholars to fix the relation of seventeenth-century science to renaissance thought. The final lecture, "Paganism and Christianity," is an essay of great brilliance on the relationship of humanism to the Augustinian tradition and to the Reformation. The book concludes with a consideration of the present place of the classics and historical learning in education and public opinion and a persuasive statement of the desirable function which they uniquely serve.

Professor Kristeller's book is one which every student of the renaissance should read; it is also one he will enjoy reading. (EDWARD WILLIAMSON, *Wesleyan University*)

*Francisco de Aldana, el divino capitán*. Por Elias L. Rivers. Badajoz: Institución de Servicios Culturales, 1955. Pp. 208. As a rule nowadays the poet is defined in etymological terms as a maker, a craftsman. In some earlier ages he was defined mystically as a superman: a divinely inspired prophet or leader of his people. Spaniards in the sixteenth century risked a charge of heresy by declaring certain of their poets to be, not merely divinely inspired, but partaking of divine essence. The first-rate Fernando de Herrera, the third-rate Miguel Sánchez, and the second-rate Francisco de Aldana, to name just three, shared the title of *el divino*. Professor Elias L. Rivers does not repudiate this compliment to his poet (cf. p. 134), but by and large he chooses matter-of-factly to ignore it, treating Aldana in the modern manner as *faber*, not *vates*. His definition of the poet seems to be "a man who writes poetry," for his procedure in the book is to study first the man (whose biography is not without interest to general historians) and then the poetry (which is not without interest to literary critics). The result is the usual schizophrenic life-and-works book, the least imaginative genre ever to afflict the humanities. It is to Mr. Rivers' credit that in this genre his is a readable and helpful work.

One of its merits is that the "life" is based on a more thorough copying of the Simancas archives than most of us nowadays have the stamina or the inclination to attempt. Many of the historical documents are here published for the first time, crowning brilliantly the solid foundation laid by Rodríguez-Moñino, who wrote "el unico estudio biográfico sobre Francisco de Aldana que vale la pena de consultar" (p. 9). A few lacunae in Aldana's life—above all, the motives of his decisions and actions—still remain, but the essentials are now clear. Mr. Rivers is to be congratulated on the abundant fruit borne by his patient searching. The best interpretation one can give to a poet's life is to collate it with similar patterns of existence. In the case of Aldana, for example, I should be inclined to compare his life with that of the many poets—from Álvarez Gato to T. S. Eliot—who have re-

nounced their youthful "unbaptized rhymes," as Herrick put it, to devote themselves to religious verse. In the constancy with which poets' careers are divided into *rimas humanas* and *rimas divinas* one might have found some illumination of the poet Aldana. A comparison with Donne or Lope de Vega might have revealed that the presence of "una libidine sana y sin inhibiciones" (p. 46) in the context of neoplatonic ideas was not so remarkable, after all.

In an important footnote to p. 42 Mr. Rivers gives his views on the relationship of "life" and "works." He takes it for granted that "desde el punto de vista estrictamente literario el valor de la biografía es sólo auxiliar, exegético a lo sumo"; but, on the other hand, the poem may be a valid biographical document. These assumptions are very dangerous, as the history of Garcilaso criticism bears witness. The first one, though cautiously phrased, may yet be too bald. It leads to an altogether unwarranted historical interpretation of poetry. The *Octavas dirigidas al Rey Don Felipe* are undoubtedly, as Mr. Rivers says, concerned with world strategy. But, much more than this, they are a cry for action—any kind of action—and a protest against Philip's "prudent" passivity. They are not an *arbitrista's* report, but canalized desire, the emotional, yet disciplined, outpouring of a poet; they express a yearning for an end, as much as a preoccupation with means:

y plántese en el cielo el estandarte,  
no del gentil, mas del christiano, Marte!

Mr. Rivers sees this point, but he is obliged by his method to refer to it as something present in the poem *in spite of* the obvious historical interpretation. "A pesar de su realismo, es en todas partes evidentísimo su celo de cruzado" (p. 105). The crusader's zeal is seen as something added, but not integrated. This historical approach writes off all that is not specific in the poem. Didactic verse of this kind is not entirely lacking in lyricism.

There is, in the third of the book which is explicitly concerned with Aldana's works, a subordination of poetry to ideas and history that is only partly redeemed by the discussion of techniques. Poetry is more than the sum of some of its parts. Mr. Rivers is at his best dissecting sonnets to examine their thematic and rhetorical structure. Unfortunately he does not stitch them together again. So, in all the analyses, the reader is left dissatisfied, with broken fragments of poetry in his hands. At times, one feels that the author is parodying Menéndez Pelayo's banal incompetence in poetic matters: "Los 142 versos no encierran más que dos ideas" (p. 170). Elsewhere, he compares what cannot be compared: the "asperezas" of Quevedo's poetry can hardly be used to justify Aldana's departures from classical "fluidéz" (p. 141). Mr. Rivers endorses Croce's belief in "la imposibilidad de hacer categorías absolutas y radicales en que cupieran los poemas" (p. 146), and then proceeds to classify, in a most un-Crocean manner, on the basis of external form and theme. D. Dámaso Alonso's modern rhetoric, again, is only a starting-point for the discussion of poetry. His studies are examinations of critical procedures; they do not pretend to say the last word about the poems chosen to illustrate his method. It is not enough to point to cases of "orden paratáctico" and "orden hipotáctico" and leave it at that. The poetry lies beyond such techniques. If Aldana's contemporaries called him *el divino* it was because they saw something of the *vates* in him. This quality is nowhere hinted at.

The book fails to answer other questions which it indirectly raises. Did Aldana

withdraw from mysticism out of modesty (p. 100), or simply because, like most devout people, he felt God's majesty to be too awful to approach? In what ways does Aldana's Christian humanism in the *Carta para Arias Montano* differ from that of Fray Luis de León? Can one be sure, after the Tillyard-Lewis controversy, that poetic sincerity is to be measured against "autobiographical confessions?" (p. 175) Is colloquialism the necessary effect of *enjambement*? (This is suggested on p. 178, but one thinks in this connection of Fray Luis's "miserable-/mente.")

The book, in conclusion, presents the fullest, most reliable life of Aldana, together with a variety of helpful footholds on his poetry. It will survive Alfredo Lefebvre's *La poética del Capitán Aldana*—because it is well printed and durable, whereas Lefebvre's volume disintegrates in the mail—and become the standard study on the poet. A worthy objective has been attained. The disappointing thing is that Mr. Rivers, as his learned articles show, is able to write more sensitively and imaginatively than he has in his book. (BRUCE W. WARDROPPER, *Ohio State University*)

*Saint Jean de Brébeuf: Les Relations de ce qui s'est passé au pays des Hurons (1635-1648)*. Publiées par Théodore Besterman. (Textes Littéraires Français, No. 72) Genève: Librairie E. Droz, 1957. Pp. xxvii + 228. To anyone acquainted, however vaguely, with the works of the French Jesuits among the Indians in New France, this book will be very disappointing. Mr. Theodore Besterman publishes Saint Jean de Brébeuf's two Relations for the years 1635 and 1636, as well as his letters to his superiors, all documents dealing with the missionary's efforts at converting the Huron Indians to Christianity. The importance of the Jesuit's writings cannot be denied, yet it is not clear why Mr. Besterman felt it necessary to publish a non-critical edition of texts almost all of which had been incorporated in Thwaites' invaluable collection of Canadian Jesuitica. The present volume contains only two short documents that are not found there. (Mr. Besterman is in error about Brébeuf's *Lettre au Très Reverend Père Mutio Vitelleschi* [1636]. It has been published before and can be found in Thwaites, XI, 6-11. The letter to the same in 1637 is in XI, 12-21 rather than 6-11.) More serious and puzzling, however, is the statement that only Parkman's studies about the Jesuits and Indians in New France need retain our attention. It seems strange, indeed, to overlook such essential scholarly contributions as Professor Chinard's *L'Amérique et le rêve exotique dans la littérature française au XVII<sup>e</sup> et au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, which had long ago called our attention to the importance of the Jesuit Relations as a link in the chain extending from Montaigne to Rousseau. These relations rightly belong to the vast ensemble of voyage accounts reflecting, as early as the seventeenth century, a whole body of social, political and religious questions, more intimately associated with eighteenth-century thought. Should not also Professor Atkinson's works constantly remind us of this fact? More recently, J. H. Kennedy's *Jesuit and Savage in New France* (Yale, 1950) clearly showed the Jesuits' role in introducing the image of the "savage" to Europe, thereby helping—ironically so—to pave the way for the Philosophes' exploitation of the concept of the "noble savage." The Jesuit Relations are an indispensable tool—and have long been recognized as such—for the study of exoticism in literature or for the analysis of a main current of thought in the history of ideas. Of this Mr. Besterman says not one word.

Granted that the scholar does not find his due here, the general reader will be

thankful for having more accessible to him some fascinating and inspiring pages by a very remarkable person. Jean de Brébeuf, one of the earliest French missionaries in Canada, abandoned a more tranquil career in the Society of Jesus and went forward to share indescribable hardships with the Hurons. He labored diligently and humbly for the conversion of those pagans. He was finally privileged—so he considered it—to sacrifice his own temporal life, secure in the belief that by sharing the cross with Our Lord he would thus call His mercy on those savages whom he loved as poor and misguided brethren.

About his strong faith—more sophisticated modern men may call it sheer naïveté—there can be no doubt. Consider a man tortured most horribly, degraded and humiliated in every way possible, flesh torn from his body roasted and eaten before his eyes, his blood drained and drunk, and finally his heart torn out, crying with joy at the thought of fulfilling God's wish and uttering only words of sympathy for his executioners! Mr. Besterman has summarized Brébeuf's death in an introduction; one wonders if a quoting in full of Regnaut's and Ragueneau's accounts (also available in Thwaites, XXXIV, 24-37, 138-48) in the style and language of the period would not have been more effective? If such was Brébeuf's attitude toward the Indians in death, what were his feelings while he still lived among them? As a firm apostle of orthodox faith he naturally saw them as sinful people, possessed, quite literally so, by the Devil. But at no time, it seems, did he treat them or even conceive of them as inferiors. They themselves are not to be hated, only the evil in them. He writes as guidance for those who may also one day become missionaries: "Faut aimer de cœur les Sauvages, les regardans comme rachetez du sang du fils de Dieu, et comme nos freres, avec lesquels nous devons passer le reste de notre vie" (p. 194).

If patience and love are required to convert the Indians, they are not beyond salvation: "Ils ne sont pas barbares au point de manquer d'un excellent bon sens et de jugement naturel" (p. 186). Brébeuf observes his savages, scorns their vices (they steal, they lie, they are lazy and lascivious), but rejoices in the good he could discern: they are hospitable and share everything they have. They may not be as far advanced as the Chinese or the Japanese, but their condition is not that of beasts. They do have councils of elders, and they do obey certain laws. This is how the chieftains exercise their functions: "Ces Capitaines icy ne gouvernent pas leurs sujets par voye d'empire, & de puissance absolue; ils n'ont point de force en main, pour les ranger à leur devoir. Leur gouvernement n'est que civil, ils representent seulement ce qu'il est question de faire pour le bien du Village, ou de tout le Pays. Apres cela se remue qui veut. Il y en a neantmoins, qui savent bien se faire obeyr, principalement quand ils ont l'affection de leurs sujets" (p. 147). The implied criticism—unwitting on the part of Brébeuf, one is convinced—of absolute power is plain to see. The eighteenth-century Philosophes will not lose the point.

Brébeuf delighted in verbal fencing with his charges. Relating the speech of one chief, he is afraid he cannot give it all the grace it had coming from the mouth of that Indian. At the end he exclaims: "Voilà la harangue de ce Capitaine, qui passeroit, à mon avis et au jugement de plusieurs pour une de celles de Tite Live, si le sujet le portoit: elle me sembla fort persuasive" (p. 152). The greatest obstacle to his own arguments, he found, was the rather disarming statement by many a savage that what may be thought to be good and right in France does not necessarily have to hold true here, in another world.

Measured in tangible results, Brébeuf's efforts would seem to have had few immediate rewards. Baptisms and conversions were few and, at times, insincere. He himself is aware of that and in his letters he stresses the fact that extreme patience is required. God's ways may be slow and mysterious, but they will triumph in their proper time. In the meantime Brébeuf tended the sick, preached to and argued with the elders, and instructed the children in whom he placed his greatest hopes. He learned the Huron language, worked on a grammar and dictionary, tools he knew were indispensable for anyone attempting to communicate effectively with the Indians. He considered his notes on the language of the utmost importance and cared more for their safety than for his own. All the while he faced the greatest hardships and was in constant danger of his own life. Not one complaint can be found in his writings, only expressions of joy at being God's humble servant, constantly fulfilling a sacred duty: *Ad maiorem Dei gloriam*. These pages reveal the moral grandeur of a man. For making it easier for the general reader to appreciate this Saint's experiences Mr. Besterman should be thanked. (W. E. THORMANN, *The Johns Hopkins University*)

Rotrou: *Venceslas*, *tragi-comédie*. Edition critique éditée par W. Leiner. Saarbrücken GmbH.: West-Ost-Verlag, 1956. Pp. 103. The most prolific seventeenth-century French playwright next to Hardy and the most talented dramatist of the first half of the century next to Corneille, Jean Rotrou is today generally unknown. Few read any of his thirty-five extant plays, and none of them is ever performed. The year 1857 which saw the publication of *Madame Bovary* and *Les Fleurs du mal*, also witnessed the last performance of a play by Rotrou on the stage of the Comédie Française. Since 1920, when the *Théâtre National de l'Odéon* staged a single performance of Rotrou's *Venceslas*, none of his works seems to have been performed in its entirety. In 1950, the *Théâtre National Populaire* paid a half-hearted tribute to Rotrou, on the occasion of the three hundredth anniversary of his death, by performing one act of *Venceslas* in the dramatist's home town, Dreux. Like many other lesser seventeenth-century French dramatists Rotrou has been relegated to the dusty archives of the literary museum, from which he will probably not emerge until a critical revaluation of his best works reveals to the public that he is eminently deserving of its attention. Already, more than one critic in the past decade has attempted to re-awaken interest in Rotrou. In 1950 Jacques Scherer published an edition of *Cosroès* (Didier), and in 1954 R. W. Ladbrough edited *Le Vritable Saint Genest* (Cambridge University Press), probably the dramatist's most moving work. Now, W. Leiner offers a critical edition of *Venceslas*, the most successful of Rotrou's plays. In these, as in other of Rotrou's works, one discovers an author of frequently superior poetic talent, who is capable of creating vividly delineated, dynamic characters as well as moving theatrical situations, which keep the reader in that state of curiosity and *agréable suspension* so dear to the seventeenth-century public. Some of the more objectionable elements of his theatre reflect the tendencies of his times as well as of his temperament. Replete with *malentendus*, characters who discover their true identity only at a critical moment of the action, complex plots, and violent *péripiéties*, his plays are also marked by the sensationalism and the alternation between bombast or preciosity and sublimity, and ferocity and gentleness, which are so typical of the preclassical (some would say baroque) period.

Of all Rotrou's plays, *Venceslas* enjoyed the public's esteem longest. An imitation



of *No ay ser padre siendo rey* by Francisco de Rojas Zorrilla, this work, which also betrays the influence of Guillén de Castro and Corneille, was probably composed between 1645 and 1647, and was first performed before the court in the latter year. Though it seems to have been staged only once during the author's lifetime, it became increasingly popular after his death in 1650 and was produced fifteen times by Molière's company between 1659 and 1680, and more than two hundred times at the Comédie Française between 1680 and 1857. Originally published as a tragic-comedy, the play, like the *Cid*, came to be designated either as a tragic-comedy or as a tragedy in its more than fifty editions between 1648 and 1925. The action is based on an obscure episode in medieval Bohemian history which Rotrou, in imitation of Rojas and capitalizing on the excitement that the marriage of Marie-Louise de Gonzague to the Polish king in 1645 had aroused in France, locates in Poland. It depicts the frenzied love of Crown Prince Ladislas for Cassandre, Duchess of Cunisberg, Ladislas's murder of his rival, whom he later discovers to have been his own brother, and the dilemma of the old king Venceslas over the fate of his criminal but popular heir.

Academically, Mr. Leiner's critical edition is thoroughly satisfying. A model of good scholarship, it constitutes an excellent *état présent des études sur Venceslas*. Basing his observations on a thorough examination of seventeenth-century sources and numerous critical and historical studies, Mr. Leiner expounds Rotrou's literary and historical sources as well as those of the dramatist's literary, political, and temperamental proclivities which determined his choice of subject. In addition, the editor offers detailed comparisons between the action, characterization, and style in Rojas's play and in Rotrou's, determines the extent to which Rotrou was indebted to Castro and to Corneille, discusses the fortunes of *Venceslas* throughout the centuries, lists all the editions of the play, and reveals how Marmontel, Lekain, and Colardeau modified the work to make it conform to eighteenth-century tastes. After the text of the play, based on editions published during Rotrou's lifetime and shortly after his death, the editor includes Marmontel's *Remarques sur le "Venceslas"* (1773). There is a useful glossary of words whose meaning has changed since Rotrou's day and a substantial bibliography of material relating to the dramatist.

However admirable from the angle of scholarship, Mr. Leiner's edition still cannot be considered a finished piece of work. Historical and statistical information, structural and textual comparisons of a text and its sources, and similar compilations of facts are doubtless indispensable to any critical edition. Equally important, however, are the evaluation of a play's literary and dramatic worth, and a study of the spirit underlying it as well as of the author's sensibility, which are all lacking in Mr. Leiner's book. A work of art is not simply the sum total of its constituent parts. It is a highly complex organism, which requires qualitative in addition to quantitative analysis. And who is better able to shed light on its more elusive elements than the person who spends months or years studying and editing it? Mr. Leiner's omissions are those of many other editors who travel solely on the well beaten paths of nineteenth-century historicism. Future editors, it is hoped, will aim their sights higher. (LEONARD J. WANG, *Columbia University*)

*Essai d'exégèse racinienne: Les Secrets Témoins*. Par J. D. Hubert. Paris: Nizet, 1956, pp. 278. Racinian criticism since the last war has been experiencing something of a renaissance. Not, of course, that books and articles on the subject ever ceased



to appear, but simply that their approach underwent a change at about that time. Scholars began to present, albeit timidly, the kind of "reevaluation" that had been applied for a considerable time to English and American literature under the neo-critical stimulus; the Lansonian and Lancastrian approaches were discarded, either wholly or in part, and there emerged, if not a new Racine, at least a Racine observed from new points of vantage. It is now of course more difficult to say anything new since the studies of May, Spitzer, Turnell and Bénichou, but Professor Hubert has nevertheless succeeded in adding to the growing body of Racinian "new criticism" a work that is frequently both original and provocative.

The author modestly calls his study an "essai d'exégèse racinienne," but it is actually more than that, since his method goes beyond exegesis to a process of interpretation and definition. The triple viewpoint from which he observes the plays is that of "inner coherence," "narcissism," and "perfection." These categories may be defined as the essential unity of Racine's plays, which rises above the conventional unities; the psychological inwardness and *amour-propre* of his characters; and lastly their agonizing search for a morally acceptable image of self. Of the three, the first is the least original and inevitably Mr. Hubert repeats certain of the discoveries of recent predecessors. Yet in this connection he manages to contribute a number of valuable insights. Discussing Racine's transformation of unity of time, he sees Pyrrhus' abandonment of *gloire* as the triumph of Hector, whose shade directs the action in a final revenge of Troy over its victorious enemies. Whether or not such an interpretation is wholly valid (I feel myself that it tends to make the protagonists somewhat too spineless), it provides an interesting angle from which to approach a play in which Racine certainly visualized his theme in terms of past heroism and present cynicism. Perhaps Mr. Hubert's richest pages on internal cohesion are those which deal with time in *Athalie*, which appears as a subtle contrast between human temporality—the rapid rhythm of the action, the various prophecies, the theme of fertility and decay—and the atemporality of the Divine scheme of things. On the development of unity of place into a uniquely Racinian dramatic value, he stresses more than any of his predecessors the symbolic function of setting, as in *Bajazet*, where the harem is not only the prison of the protagonists but a *situs* of terror prefiguring "l'ordre accoutumé"—the ruthless despotism and amorality of the Orient.

Mr. Hubert links the Racinian character's "narcissism" with his third standard of measurement, perfection. For the author, in what comes close to a Sartrean analysis, the chief clue to Racinian tragedy lies in the tragic figure's organized search for a confirmation of his own essence in the eyes of another, usually the one he loves. Thus, unlike the Cornelian hero, Pyrrhus cares nothing for acting admirably in itself, but strives merely to see, reflected in Andromaque's gaze, a perfected image of himself. Of Mr. Hubert's three categories, this last is likely to encounter the greatest resistance from Racinian scholars. Yet his excellent choice of quotations and careful analysis produce a strong argument for Pyrrhus, Néron, Mithridate, as "personnages condamnés [qui] cherchent à posséder ce qui manque à leur essence," and if this does not provide us with a total exegesis, it at least compels us to reexamine the possibility that such "violent" characters are more reflective and lucid than we have generally assumed them to be.

The three categories appear in differing proportions in other plays: in *Iphigénie* the second dominates and tragedy results from the conflict between the inner iden-

tity and the public self and the character's tendency to sacrifice the former to the latter. And to the various reasons already advanced by critics for setting *Phèdre* apart from the other plays, Mr. Hubert's approach permits him to add that *Phèdre* is the first tragedy to divorce passionate love from the quest for perfection.

Inevitably one finds things to quarrel with in the course of such a thorough and painstaking study of Racine's eleven tragedies. On a few occasions, Mr. Hubert overstretches a quotation or even a character to fit his approach. For instance need we interpret Pyrrhus' defiance of the Greeks—"Qu'ils cherchent dans l'Épire une seconde Troie"—as a desire to play the role of Hector? It would have surely been enough to say, without invalidating the main premise, that Pyrrhus repeatedly framed his discourse in terms of the battle of Troy, which reveals his tragic inability to escape the past. Nor can I agree that Oreste appears chiefly as an admirer and would-be emulator of Pyrrhus; to present him as such is to ignore the atmosphere of hostility between the two which Racine makes apparent from the beginning. At times, especially in earlier chapters, perhaps striving for completeness, Mr. Hubert unnecessarily restates commonplaces of Racinian criticism. Thus it is incongruous to find, in the concluding paragraphs of his usually original and thought-provoking Introduction the statement that "Racine trouvait moins de difficulté que Corneille à observer la règle des trois unités et sa facilité à cet égard venait de ce qu'il chargeait ses intrigues de très peu de matière" (p. 30), which is not only an old saw, but an inexact one, as Mr. Hubert himself demonstrates later on.

But such minor drawbacks are the one unfortunate result of a generally successful method. His three categories enable him to examine each play exhaustively, both structurally and poetically as well as dramatically, and he neglects no element, however small, in the process. His treatment of *La Thébaine* and *Alexandre* is the fullest that has been accorded those plays because he brings to the study the same precision of analysis as he does to an *Andromaque* or a *Phèdre*. Again he can project the well-known parallelism in *Esther* between Assuérus and Jehovah—the king as the earthly representative of the divine—into a view of the play as a symbol of the Last Judgment.

In his concluding chapter Mr. Hubert briefly adduces reasons for the downfall of French tragedy after Racine; chief among these is the dissociation of sensibility and intelligence typical of the "tragédies" of Crébillon and Voltaire. His final paragraph looks forward to a thorough study of the reasons for this phenomenon, which, in view of his present achievement we shall await with anticipation. (JOHN C. LAPP, *University of California, Los Angeles*)

*Paris Theatre Audiences in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.* By John Lough. London: Oxford University Press, 1957. Pp. vii + 293. By way of confirming through historical scholarship the "revisionist" theories of intrinsic critics which have made seventeenth-century studies so lively in recent years, we now have Professor Lough's systematic, if over-long, examination of the audiences of perhaps the two most important centuries of French drama. Bringing to bear upon the subject the same doggedness and respect for fact (the literary historian's equivalent of the critic's "text") which critics like W. G. Moore and E. B. O. Borgerhoff have brought to individual works and authors of the period, Mr. Lough has succeeded in putting to final rest many of the clichés of traditional scholarship. He scotches in particular the facile assumption that the "épuration du théâtre" which occurred in the fourth

decade of the seventeenth century must be attributed to the dropping-off of the plebeian audience of the "Age of Alexandre Hardy" (Part I of this study). The documents are far too meagre to describe the audiences of the period in this way, Lough rightly contends, but if one wishes to rely on *all of them* they point not only to the attendance of courtly circles but also to a "grossièreté" of the court as pronounced as that of the plebeian elements of the audience. And as the documents (still too meagre for anything more than an informed speculation) become more numerous "from Corneille to Lesage" (Part II of the study) they point to the persistence of the courtly influence over that of the lower orders and, indeed, of a courtly influence marked both by a certain taste for the cruder and commoner side of things as well as by a certain freedom from the prescriptions of the "doctes" and the "savants."

Lough adduces various statistics to support this view, and his good sense with figures is shown in his rejection of Lancaster's claim that "well over 100,000 different individuals" were present at the Comédie Française in the theatrical year 1682-1683 taken by Lancaster as typical of the period 1680-1701. (The Comédie, by the way, serves primarily as the basis for Lough's entire study not only because more facts and figures are available on it than on any other theatre but also because of its virtual monopoly of the best writing of the period). Simply by considering the *make-up* of the 150,000 total for the year from which Lancaster makes his unsupported estimate, Lough comes to the more likely figure of 40,000 different individuals for the year as typical, with the average daily attendance coming well below 500 persons. And, except for a perplexing slump in the period 1715-1750, these figures increased "from Marivaux to Beaumarchais" (Part III of the study), with the average number of tickets bought at the door in the period 1771-1774 being over 180,000. If the occupants of the *petites loges* are taken into account, the figure is more likely to be 240,000. Mr. Lough insists that the audience was primarily upper-class in orientation if not in statistical make-up. Numerous comments on the presence in the *parterre* of the lower orders in the years just before the Revolution reflect more the exception than the rule.

The author's thesis runs parallel to the "elite theory" established by Gaston Paris and others nearly a century ago in Medieval studies, which directly countered the positivistic assumption that the presence of crudity and vulgarity in a work testified to the shaping influence if not the actual authorship of *le peuple*. Yet the thesis hardly needs the elaborate documentation for seventeenth-century studies which is given here. Open-minded students of the period do not have to be persuaded that the worth-while dramatists of these two centuries appealed to an upper-class sensibility. What remains to be settled is the meaning of "upper-class." Mr. Lough is too arbitrary and literal-minded in his conception of the "aristocracy" to which he assigns the shaping influence in matters of taste in this period. He has too narrow a notion of the distinction between the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy in the eighteenth century in particular. Indeed, as far back as Molière, the lines between the upper bourgeoisie and the minor aristocracy had begun to blur in such a way as to make nebulous the fine distinctions which Mr. Lough would prolong into the very dawn of the first Bastille Day. He himself succeeds in modifying the catch-all notion of "the rise of the middle class" only by pointing to the relatively low level of taste of the aristocracy throughout the two centuries in question. This raises the interesting possibility that the bourgeoisie, perhaps more susceptible to the refinements of the "doctes" and "savants," was superior on the

average to the aristocracy. Yet, questions of taste might better be kept apart in the matter, for, as Mr. Lough often shows, the evidence is contradictory and ambiguous: now the *parterre* is said to have the best taste, now the *cour*, etc. More relevant to the distinctions Mr. Lough would make is the sense of station: at what point did it cease to be dependent upon birth and, further, is there any evidence that the bourgeois notion of station conferred by achievement was ever considered in this period superior to the aristocratic notion of station conferred by birth?

A consideration of such matters would have enlarged the significance of this long study. But wedded to his thesis, Mr. Lough barely gets beyond the documents to illustrate it. His single-mindedness also leads on occasion to a certain testiness which mars the even tone of his exposition. It is to be hoped that his thesis having now been thoroughly documented (proof is a relative term in this area), Mr. Lough will continue with more equanimity and more flexibility the history of classical taste of which this book might properly be considered the first volume. (ROBERT J. NELSON, *Yale University*)

*Diderot: The Testing Years, 1713-1759.* By Arthur M. Wilson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957. Pp. xii + 417. This is a splendid book. It does honor to the Modern Language Association-Oxford University Press Award Committee, to the author, and to American scholarship. The first satisfactory biography of Diderot in any language, it is the life of the whole man, the emotional and intellectual aspects in proper balance, as befits the *philosophe par excellence*, who combined an encyclopedic mind with a "cœur sensible."

While Professor Wilson's feat can luckily not be called a "dramatic" biography, it is built around the drama of the early years of the *Encyclopédie*, from the Prospectus of his Prologue to the eve of ultimate triumph against the overwhelming odds of the year 1759 described in his Epilogue. The twenty-five chapters in between give a detailed and accurate chronological account of the first forty-six years of Diderot's life: his childhood, education, and marriage; his early publications and personal relationships. The work is thoroughly documented and well indexed. The notes, collected at the end, are a scholar's delight, from which an excellent and comprehensive critical bibliography can be gleaned. Professor Wilson has covered an amazing amount of ground. He has joined a close reading and deep understanding of Diderot's works, including the *Encyclopédie*, to an intimate acquaintance with the work of scholars who have preceded him. He takes his good where he finds it, gratefully, without the least hint of polemics. When a decision is not clear-cut, the notes give ample information concerning contrary judgments. He has observed the highest traditions of scholarship and proved himself a great Diderot scholar.

For one reviewer the reading of this book is a humiliating as well as a joyous experience—he learns too much from its wealth of material to presume to criticize. When his former fund of knowledge of Diderot can be called on, however, he finds the work judicious as well as comprehensive. He may not be sure that the André-François Le Breton who was a mason in 1729 was not a homonym of the publisher (p. 75); he may agree with Mr. Besterman that it was Frederick, not Voltaire, who quipped about placing Mme du Châtelet's late-born child among her miscellaneous works (p. 102); he may have information which was published too late to be included on the last years of De Prades (p. 156); he may be less willing than the author to accept the strictures of Raymond Naves, whose scholarship and judg-

ment were usually so sound, in regard to Voltaire's relations with the *Encyclopédie* (pp. 214, 288). But he will find the chapters on that great work excellent and informative indeed, especially chapter 11, which deals, among other things, with Diderot's reasons for not publishing elsewhere, after 1759; he will like the analysis of Diderot's humanism (p. 245); and welcome enthusiastically Professor Wilson's own hypothesis that much of Diderot's trouble with the authorities was occasioned by the fact that the French used the one word *âme* for what in English is expressed by two words with very different connotations, "soul" and "mind" (p. 148).

Diderot's solemn exordium in his *Pensées sur l'interprétation de la nature*, at which his enemies laughed scornfully and which Voltaire called "déclamation à la Jean-Jacques," may be used to conclude an inadequate review: "Young man, take and read." For this is not only an exciting biography, it is an excellent introduction to French eighteenth-century life and thought. Many a reader besides the scholar likes his biography straight: factual, detailed, comprehensive, judicious, yet artfully presented by a master hand. (NORMAN L. TORREY, *Columbia University*)

*Voltaire et l'affaire des Natifs: Un Aspect de la carrière humanitaire du patriarche de Ferney.* Par Jane Ceitac. Genève: E. Droz, 1956. Pp. 224. This book is valuable for its thorough documentation and presentation of new material, chiefly from the State Archives and the Public Library of Geneva. Included are some unedited letters of Voltaire. The author is thus able to correct to some degree the great work of Gustave Desnoiresterres and to throw a more favorable light on Voltaire's role in the struggle of the Natifs for civil and finally political equality.

In the mid-eighteenth century Geneva was a restricted aristocracy—Calvin's theocratic doctrines were definitely hostile to popular sovereignty—in which the power rested in the hands of the old families. There was always a great deal of confusion in the appellations applied to the different classes of her people: the Citoyens and Bourgeois, who alone possessed full civil and political privileges, the Habitants, chiefly a continuing stream of Huguenot refugees from France who purchased the right to dwell in the city, and the Natifs, Genevan born children of the Habitants, who suffered severe economic handicaps and complete political disability. These last came to constitute the predominant class of skilled artisans upon whom Genevan industry depended. It was for them that Rousseau sounded the clarion call of liberty in his *Contrat social* and for them that Voltaire attempted to put in practice the theories of toleration and humanity expressed in his *Traité sur la tolérance*, first in the golden dream of Versoix, and after the fall of Choiseul, at Ferney.

The author's work suffers from faulty organization and a lack of careful editing. The documentary material has not been sufficiently digested. On too many a page each sentence constitutes a paragraph. Note references are often difficult to understand. In the middle chapters Voltaire is lost sight of, except for the refrain that his moral support and humanitarianism—and Rousseau's ideas of popular sovereignty—were always a very important background for Geneva's almost bloodless Revolution.

And yet there is no denying that Voltaire's role was of the greatest significance. In 1765 he instigated the initial "Requête," pushed the cause too far into the fire as was his wont, and got his fingers burnt. Both enemies and friends considered him the great influence behind the movement. It was by no mere chance that the appeal to Humanity became more and more frequent, especially after the "Riot" of 1770,



as well as man's claim to inalienable rights, both in Europe and America, during that decade; proof again that the summing up of the century is found in the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen*.

This is not an easy book to read, but well worth the effort. (NORMAN L. TORREY, *Columbia University*)

*Raynal et sa machine de guerre: L'Histoire des deux Indes et ses perfectionnements.* Par Hans Wolpe. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1957. Pp. 252. Professor Wolpe's scholarly yet readable study of Abbé Raynal's *Histoire des deux Indes* should do much to reawaken interest in a writer and a work mentioned by all eighteenth-century scholars, as John Morley has suggested, but read by very few. This neglect is understandable, because Raynal's book is from a literary consideration third rate or at best second rate. Moreover its contents are uninteresting and dated today despite the popularity it enjoyed in its own day and notwithstanding Mr. Wolpe's assertion that "même de nos jours, le livre de Raynal se lit avec intérêt."

Mr. Wolpe's enthusiasm is commendable, stemming as it does from a profound knowledge of Raynal and of his secondary sources and especially because it is tempered on the whole by a scholarly objectivity. The result is a well-written and interesting book that must henceforth be taken into account by any future Raynal scholar.

Like Anatole Feugère, Mr. Wolpe has selected the 1770, 1774, and 1780 editions of the *Histoire des deux Indes* as the significant editions from the point of view of changes in the text and uses these to study the economic, sociological, political, religious, and moral ideas. The 1770 edition is recognized as the fundamental text, and it is compared with the two important variants to show the enrichment and development of ideas as well as the changing and sometimes contradictory nature of Raynal.

Mr. Wolpe devotes many pages to Diderot, by far the most important of the many voluntary or involuntary contributors to the *Histoire des deux Indes*, and expands successfully upon Anatole Feugère's and Herbert Dieckmann's studies of the encyclopedist's contribution. Mr. Wolpe wisely concludes that there is as yet no final answer to this thorny problem even after Professor Dieckmann's discovery of the "Pensées détachées" and the "Fragments imprimés" in the *Fonds Vandeul*.

It is also correctly pointed out by Mr. Wolpe, as it was by Anatole Feugère, that in spite of the multiple-authorship of the *Histoire des deux Indes*, Raynal is nevertheless the most important figure in the composition of every edition. To begin with, despite his wholesale borrowings and wide-scale acquisitions, Raynal contributed by far more material than Deleyre, Pechméja, or Diderot, the men generally accepted as the most substantive contributors to Raynal's work. Add to this fact Raynal's well-known habit of recasting or revising all the materials he borrowed, plagiarized, or bought and the result was that he managed to give to all these disparate segments a unifying and uniform imprint identifiably his own.

The *Histoire des deux Indes* has been almost universally adjudged a "machine de guerre." This is Mr. Wolpe's central thesis as the title suggests, and the overall material of this study supports this contention. The reader of this work, however, is sometimes confronted with seeming contradictions. For example, it becomes difficult to reconcile statements referring to Raynal's work as "l'ouvrage qui multiplie

les appels à la révolte" with repeated references to Raynal's allegiance to Louis XVI and to monarchical authority in general. But these discrepancies are the result of Raynal's changeability, not Mr. Wolpe's inconsistency, inasmuch as the latter makes an effort to explain and reconcile these conflicting statements.

Mr. Wolpe has made a real contribution to eighteenth-century scholarship in a field long neglected. One might only wish that he had supplied this important work with an index and a bibliography. (VIRGIL W. TOPAZIO, *University of Rochester*)

*Lamartine*. Par M.-F. Guyard. Paris: Editions Universitaires, 1956. Pp. 113. Books, like men, seem to possess a limited vitality; only a few of them ever show the power necessary to carry them beyond the critical challenge of successive generations of readers. In general, the works of most of the French romanticists have failed to live up to the promise they held during the past century. The excitement of the great "revolt" has faded into the dim precincts of literary history and the Cénacle has become a curiosity to the contemporary world. And of all these great writers, Lamartine has lost the largest share of prestige and renown. His vision of the world evokes little modern response; he has dated fastest, being now relegated to the ignominy of being a man whose poetry is "required reading" in survey courses.

M. Guyard recognizes this state of affairs and, with praiseworthy zeal, hopes to rescue Lamartine from the limbo of the forgotten in a small biography written to reach the largest possible audience. Admittedly the book is not original, since it owes much to Maurice Levaillant, Henri Guillemin, and the Marquise de Luppé, among others. It is specifically an apologia, an attempt to place Lamartine in proper focus, not as a pious sheep lost in the maze of politics, but as a virile man close in mind and spirit to the twentieth century.

Trapped within the confines of a small book, M. Guyard has avoided the problems of the biographer faced with the necessity of constructing an integral personality. Instead he offers a series of essays on different aspects of Lamartine's character, basing them on the assumption that once a man is thus established in his authenticity, a reader can more easily penetrate works that are really inseparable from an author's life. Therefore, after a short introduction on Lamartine's attitudes toward such basic aspects of life as money, love, religion, and politics, Mr. Guyard divides his work into two obvious sections on the poet and the prose writer.

The unifying principle to the full life Lamartine led, he sums up in the phrase "grand seigneur démocrate." For him Lamartine was a believer in the myth of the earth, a country dweller who always considered himself an amateur writer. More interested in politics than in books, he labored for what he considered the common weal until the revolution of 1848 disillusioned him. Religious, but not orthodox, he was continually haunted by a question he could not answer: "Dieu, nous aime-t-Il vraiment?" Perhaps not. Witness the death of his beloved children, his rejection of Catholicism, and the gall-filled years after the fall from power, years of hack work and the tireless publication of pot-boilers to pay off strangling debts. By then Lamartine was a pathetic figure, already on the road to literary oblivion.

M. Guyard's book contains all the well-known facts, with which no one can quarrel. One may, however, object to the author's insistence on finding categories into which to fit all Lamartine's activities, his penchant for words ending in *-ism*, or the manner in which he defends himself from possible criticism: "Les médiocres seuls trouveront là de quoi mettre en doute la sincérité religieuse de Lamartine."

Similarly his use of René La Senne's *Traité de caractérologie* does not help illuminate *La Chute d'un ange*. M. Guyard is to be congratulated on his gallant defense of a great nineteenth-century poet, but his readers will still wonder how much a poetry defined as "la respiration d'une âme" can say to the present age. (ALBERT J. GEORGE, *Syracuse University*)

*Edgar Quinet: A Study in French Patriotism*. By Richard Howard Powers. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1957. Pp. xvi + 207.

"Whatever his shortcomings, he was vastly superior to the ordinary twentieth-century historian who in describing the facts tends always to justify them" (p. 160). In this tribute to Quinet, Mr. Powers refers to the judgment of the Revolutions of 1789, 1830, and 1848 that failed to realize the ideal and brought about unfortunate consequences: the rule of Robespierre who, according to Quinet, turned the guillotine against the wrong enemy; the numerous moments of conservative reaction; the third Empire that drove Quinet into exile. It is more customary to present Quinet with Michelet and Mickiewicz as a member of the "trilogie du Collège de France" advocating the reestablishment of the revolutionary spirit and preparing for 1848. Mr. Powers portrays a different Quinet who does not "justify" the Revolution. The greater part of the book traces his growing disillusionment with the revolutionary-liberal tradition; the last two chapters recount Quinet's ultimate conclusion (after 1851) that the Catholic church was the true enemy of progress and was to blame for reaction and Empire. 1789 should have exterminated *it*, not the aristocracy; 1830 and 1848 failed to destroy this power bent on undoing the ideal. To Mr. Powers, "Quinet's final acceptance of intolerance was one of his most interesting aspects" (p. 173) and "if Quinet's nationalism was neither intolerant nor exclusive, his religion was both and took precedence. He could bear no dissent, no compromise [. . .] He learned the wisdom of intolerance" (p. 168-69). Despite the title, this is the thesis and central theme of the book; it becomes truly animated only when dealing with the religious issue.

This is not an easy book to read. The style is awkward: "Coincidence can hardly explain the appropriate moment of its publication" (p. 87) means that so opportune a moment of publication could not have been chosen by coincidence; "he began to preach the destruction of liberty" (p. 149) means that he attacked the Catholic perversion of *liberté, égalité, fraternité* (cf. pp. 122-23). Finally there are instances of fundamental confusion, e.g., when Mr. Powers says that Quinet was more attracted to Vico's idealism than to Herder's determinism and preferred Vico to Herder (p. 43-45); this makes Vico a religious idealist, Herder an eighteenth-century materialist.

Mr. Powers does make his contribution. He found that Quinet planned to translate Herder before he met Cousin (p. 28); he studies the details of Quinet's political involvement and the machinations needed to obtain his mission to Greece and his professorships; he relates the difficult relations with Minna Moré, Quinet's first wife, to his views on Germany. The polemics against the Jesuits and the Catholic church are emphasized. As a historian, the author does not dwell on literary aspects or esthetic qualities; he does not discuss the personal experiences reflected in *Ahasvérus*. He is most interesting when he deals with Quinet's religious interpretation of the Revolution and has the merit of having written the first book devoted to Quinet to appear in English. (OSCAR A. HAAC, *Emory University*)

*The Unheroic Hero in the Novels of Stendhal, Balzac, and Flaubert.* By Raymond Giraud. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1957. Pp. 240. This thoughtful study, originally presented as a doctoral dissertation in Yale University, centers on the interplay between that social change which saw the *bourgeoisie* become the dominant class in France after the Revolution and the resulting literary change which saw so many writers adopt a virulent anti-bourgeois attitude. The irony in the interplay of these two changes, of course, was that the *bourgeoisie*, whose materialistic thinking and low taste so alienated the nineteenth-century writer, formed nevertheless the bulk of the reading public on whom, under the new economic conditions, that same writer was forced to depend for his career. Moreover, since the writer himself was often of bourgeois origin, and since he could scarcely avoid drawing on the world around him for the materials of his art, it was inevitable that his anti-bourgeois sentiment had to be maintained at no small cost to himself in unresolved conflicts and ambivalent feelings. It is Professor Giraud's thesis, in this book, that these conflicts and ambivalent feelings induced the nineteenth-century novelist to define a new concept of heroism in the novel, embodied in a protagonist whom the novelist himself both admired and scorned. This new breed of hero was both nobly sensitive and lamentably weak; he had finer qualities of soul that gain our sympathy, but he lacked the stuff of the heroic ideal. He was, in short, an unheroic hero.

Having thus defined his subject, Professor Giraud proceeds, in three successive chapters, to spell out its meaning as it applies to each of three major novelists: Stendhal, Balzac, and Flaubert. The analysis is particularized and deepened by the selection of one novel for each writer as the clearest case of his portrayal of an unheroic hero: *Lucien Leuwen* for Stendhal, *César Birotteau* for Balzac, and *L'Education sentimentale* for Flaubert. Moreover, it is shown that these three novelists mark the progress of the bourgeois advance to social dominance. Stendhal confronted a society in which bourgeois inroads were only incipient, and there was, in his hostility, at least as much nostalgia for the eighteenth-century *douceur de vivre* as there was distaste for the contemporary scene. Balzac, more the child of a bourgeois century, was the most committed of the three to its ideals—witness his avid pursuit of money and success. Yet he was also acutely aware of the betrayal of art inherent in those ideals, and his novels bear the trace of his conflict. Flaubert was, of course, the most outspoken bourgeois-hater of the century, reflecting the fact that, by his time, bourgeois ideals had passed beyond their period of energy and achievement and had become a stifling weight on the social order. Flaubert saw bourgeois influence as no longer restricted to a single class: it was a poison to be found throughout society, a way of thinking that had invaded the public mind, and from which he felt the need to flee not only spiritually but even physically.

The author's decision to base the demonstration of his thesis on the intensive analysis of three novels naturally begs the question of method in this study. Certainly the advantages from the expansive and detailed probing possible when only three works are under scrutiny cannot be called small. And it is true that the use of numerous works, all hastily referred to, can confuse rather than clarify. One feels, nevertheless, that three novels form too frail a base to support a theme-study such as this. Corroborative examples from other writers would have lent welcome weight to the argument of this thesis. Nonetheless, the author's argument itself is persuasive. The cases for Stendhal, Balzac, and Flaubert are made with

admirable skill, clarity and insight, revealing both a careful and a thoughtful reading of the texts. If the reader initially supposes that there can be no meaningful link among three such oddly-assorted figures as Lucien Leuwen, César Birotteau, and Frédéric Moreau, he ends by being convinced that the same ambiguities are present in the character of each, and that these ambiguities can, in each case, be traced to the tension within the novelist between the heroic ideal and the demands of realism.

Many a reader will doubtless reflect that the qualities and weaknesses ascribed to the unheroic hero also seem to fit that more familiar literary personage, the victim of *le mal du siècle*: René, Obermann, Chatterton, Dominique, et al. The similarity is all the greater since both types are associated with anti-bourgeois sentiment. Yet they are not interchangeable types: César Birotteau could surely never qualify as a victim of *le mal du siècle*, for example. It might have been a useful and enriching addition to his study had Professor Giraud made an effort to define the distinction between these two types, so similar and yet not identical.

The final chapter of this study, which suggests parallels in contemporary American literature with that of France a century ago, is an innovation in scholarly books which should be commended and, when possible, emulated. While it leaves aside the usual rigorous documentation in order to speculate discursively, this chapter proves stimulating and suggestive, adding new dimensions and significance, as well as liveliness, to the basic thesis propounded in the book. Perhaps the chief value of the chapter is that it underlines a basic similarity between the problems of literary creation in the twentieth century and those in the nineteenth. Indeed, it is probable that the lasting significance of this study will turn out to be the contribution it makes to our understanding that, since the French Revolution, the world of letters has been preoccupied steadily with much the same set of moral and esthetic problems, and that there is no major literary concern of the twentieth century with which the nineteenth century had not already, in essence, been actively engaged.

A final remark concerning the index with which this book is provided: it lists only references to real persons, and has no listings for titles or for fictional characters. Considering the subject matter of the study, one wonders whether such an index has not omitted, for economy, precisely those listings for which a reader is most likely to consult it. (MURRAY SACHS, *Williams College*)

*Julio Herrera y Reissig and the Symbolists.* By Bernard Gicovate. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957. Pp. 106. This book is the first attempt in English to define the stylistic qualities of a Spanish-American poet, for here we have a work concerned with definition of esthetic values and the analysis of the creative process. Julio Herrera y Reissig, the Uruguayan poet of the *modernista* movement, is certainly one of the most picturesque figures in the literary history of Spanish America. With remarkable economy Professor Gicovate has defined his paradoxical personality and his eccentricity.

The first chapter deals with the relations between Modernismo and French poetry, especially with the Parnassian school and Symbolism; it explains, in a somewhat elementary way, the origins of Modernismo in such poets as Julián del Casal, José Martí, Gutiérrez Nájera, and José Asunción Silva; it mentions the historical importance of *Azul* (1888), the first work definitely "modernista," and



accounts for Darío's lack of enthusiasm for Mallarmé's poetry by "the extreme esotericism of Mallarmé's late works and the historical events of the end of the century" (p. 12).

The chapter on influences in the works of Herrera y Reissig is one of the highlights of the book. These influences are, in order of importance, the following: Rubén Darío, Baudelaire, Verlaine, Mallarmé, Samain: "After 1903 his use of rural themes reveals a deliberate decision to continue in the footsteps of Samain" (p. 33).

In Chapter III the influence of Symbolism is established in the process that Gicovate calls the passage from image to myth: "The suggestive power of an image, when incorporated into a context, can radiate and penetrate the several spheres of meaning necessary in the creation of a symbol" (p. 41).

Chapters IV, V and VI deal with the intrinsic aspects of Herrera's poetry and the explanation of his creative process. Gicovate sees in this poetry the nervousness of modern spleen, neurasthenia, guilt, and remorse: "Here, for the first time, Herrera's concern with the problem of good and evil becomes evident. In him, as in the French decadents, the paraphernalia of satanism very often produced the morbid tones and the blasphemous pose in fashion since the Romantics" (p. 56).

Of real merit is Gicovate's contribution to the "private diction" of this poet, the value of the incantatory in reproducing earlier descriptive moods, the linguistic ambivalence between a vocabulary "at times homely, almost plebeian, and, in the same poem, luxurious, or remote and dreamlike" (p. 63). The same conflict may be observed in the spiritual world of Herrera since "in him a Catholic imagination accompanied non-catholic conceptions" (p. 79).

There are a few debatable statements in this book. On page 1, Gicovate says: "In the last two hundred years inspiration has been derived primarily from French sources"; but, discounting the influence of the Encyclopedia, French literary influences did not begin to act until the Romantic period. On page 3, the author says that José Martí's *Ismaelillo* (1882) "is considered the first collection of poetry of the modernista movement." I believe that Dr. Gicovate is accepting wrong judgment here. On page 9 he states: "In the edition of 1900 [of *Azul*] several 'Medallones' were added"; these "Medallones" appeared in the Guatemala edition of 1890, an important fact in dealing with the question of influences. Again, on page 14, the author says: "In *El canto errante* (1907) his poetry is enriched with a new irony, a deeper disillusionment, and the use of deliberate prosaisms," but seems to forget that *El canto errante* is a collection of poems published previously in magazines, some of which date as far back as 1892 ("A Colón") or 1893 ("A Francia").

On page 79, there is a mistake of transcription in the sonnet "Color de sueño": instead of "quién eres, al fin, la interrogué, me dijo", it should read: "Quién era, al fin, la interrogué,—me dijo"; otherwise, the hendecasyllable would be deficient.

Professor Gicovate's first phrase in his Preface is: "A technical study of poetry seems to require an excuse in these days." However, we wish to assure him that he does not need an excuse to study one of the great poets of the Spanish language, though unfortunately little known outside Spanish America, and that Dr. Gicovate is eminently qualified to do this type of work. (A. TORRES-RIOSECO, *University of California, Berkeley*)

*Rainer Maria Rilke: Lettres milanaises, 1921-1926.* Introduction et textes de liaison par Renée Lang. Paris: Plon, 1956. Pp. 122. Another collection of Rilke letters is added to the ever increasing publications of his correspondence. This one is written in French and addressed to Aurelia Gallarati-Scotti, wife of the well known Italian littérateur Duke Tommaso Gallarati-Scotti. Rilke had met the Duchess as a young girl before World War I at the salon of her aunt, Countess Valmarana at Venice, but had known her only slightly. In 1921 she wrote him a note, reminding him of their chance acquaintance, thus initiating a correspondence which, although they never met again, is the expression of a sincere friendship and of many common interests. Her husband was then associated with the literary circle *Il Convoglio*, a group which met at the palace of the Gallarati-Scotti at Milan and which was anxious to invite the poet for a lecture. Rilke's increasingly bad health prevented him from accepting the invitation. The collection contains twenty-two letters by Rilke, some of them rather long.

The letters of the Duchess are given in excerpts sufficiently large to maintain the continuity of the correspondence. One of the delightful features of the little volume is the connecting text with which Dr. Lang has linked the letters and which contains, beside the excerpts from the letters of the Duchess, sketches of Rilke's letters, very skilfully giving the necessary data about his life, explaining persons and events, and throwing just enough light on the human situation to produce the effect of a continuous story. Without Dr. Lang's concise connecting text which brings to life a period of very lively literary activity in France as well as in Italy, the correspondence would be a rather fragmentary exchange, and only of minor interest.

For the Rilke scholar there is not much truly new information. The poet discusses with the Duchess the Italian translation of his *Cornet*, he deplores with her the death of the Duse and lets her participate in his renewed contacts with France and French *hommes de lettres*. None of this is unknown, and, as a rule, his German expressions of similar thoughts and reactions are more complex and richer than his always somewhat hesitating and never quite flawless French. Valéry's famous visit at Muzot appears only in the connecting text and in a rather malicious post-card written by Valéry from Milan and co-signed by the Duchess.

The only real interest of the letters is political. Rilke's views are not only "surprising" as Dr. Lang generously puts it in her introduction, but downright frightening. In contrast to the Duchess, whose circle was strongly opposed to Mussolini, Rilke praises not only the man and his brilliant speeches, but also the new order Mussolini introduced into Italy: "[...] la sécurité règne. Et pourquoi règne-t-elle? Parce que le gouvernement gouverne. De quelle rude manière, peu importe; peu importe que la presse soit jugulée, que les politiciens soient brimés. La vraie liberté c'est l'ordre dans la rue" (pp. 80-81). Utterances such as these are repeated the more the Duchess contradicts him. The motivations for this defense of Fascism are twofold: he saw around him in Central Europe the lack of discipline and the half-hearted use that was made of "freedom." As he puts it, the century suffers from an overdose of liberty: "C'est trop peu que la liberté; même employée avec mesure et justesse, elle nous laisse à mi-chemin, dans le champ étroit de notre raison" (p. 84). The second motivation is the fact that he had imposed upon himself a strict discipline in his poetry (p. 83) and thus dislikes all vulgarity resulting from lack of discipline: "[...] et il faut vraiment croire

qu'une certaine force qui s'emploie pour créer l'ordre (soit dans l'art, soit dans la vie) possède, même là où elle s'impose brusquement, un peu de cette profonde innocence qu'on attribue à la nature" (p. 85). A lovely poetic statement, to which Dr. Lang rightly remarks that the poet gets somewhat mixed up on the relation between art and life.

Rilke's pro-Fascist tendencies are void of any personal experience; they are the irresponsible statements of a poet living far away from the actual happenings. It is a sad spectacle to find him unable to distinguish between true discipline and the violence, injustice and cruelty of the *régime*, which became obvious as early as 1923. All of his Fascist letters date from the last year of his life, at the time of his progressing last illness. But they do not help to enhance the picture we have of the man, much as we may admire his poetry, which fortunately remained uncontaminated.

In her introduction, Dr. Lang makes a valuable contribution to scholarship through her discussion of Rilke's relation to Italy, its cities, artists and writers. A note (p. 50) tells us that she also intends to edit Rilke's French letters to M. and Mme Paul Morisse. The little volume was planned to appear simultaneously in France and Italy, the latter edition being done in co-operation with Mme Lavinia Mazzucchetti-Jollos. (LISELOTTE DIECKMANN, *Washington University, St. Louis*)

*Bibliografía crítica de la nueva estilística aplicada a las literaturas románicas.* Por Helmut Hatzfeld. (Biblioteca románica hispánica, I). Madrid: Gredos, 1955. Pp. 660. This translation by E. L. Criado of the *Bibliography of the New Stylistics* (1953) is much more than a Spanish version of the American original; it is considerably enlarged and renders the *Bibliography* obsolete. The number of publications reviewed jumps from about 1600 to 2045, and 370 of the additions were published in 1953-54. A French edition is in preparation. This speaks well for the vitality of the study of style: more and more Romance scholars every day are turning to stylistic methods as the only objective basis for literary criticism. Professor Hatzfeld has taken into account the suggestions of his various reviewers but has not modified his methodological preferences, and here I see no reason to modify my criticisms either (see *RR*, XLVI [1955], 49-52). The book is, however, a most valuable instrument of research. Although in the body of the work articles are treated at greater length than many important books, this fault has been somewhat corrected in the additions. Omission of reviews is still the worst defect, especially where there is a controversy (e.g. the varying reactions to Guiraud's use of statistics in style studies; Spitzer's criticism of Sayce in *Critique*, No. 98; Levy on Spitzer, *Sy*, 1949, pp. 321 ff., etc.). The scope is broader than in 1953; more attention is given to stylistic studies of general interest on non-Romance languages and to stylistic implications of linguistic research; still missing are the works of A. A. Hill, J. Whatmough, Zipf, the school of Prague (Mukarovsky is cited, but not Prochazka or V. Mathesius, both available in English or German), or H. Ponga, "Zur Methode der Stilforschung," *GRM*, 1929, pp. 256 ff. Should be added to the following numbers: 277-79, K. Wais, "Traduction, adaptation et transposition poétique," *Homenaje a F. Kruger* (Mendoza, 1955), II, 575-89, on Mallarmé in German; 742, Crétin, *Lexique des métaphores de Corneille et Racine*; 1362, Strohmeier, "Aussenschau und Innenschau," *NZ*, 1950, p. 1-11; 1576-80, Boyle, "The

Nature of Metaphor," *Mod. Schoolman*, 1954, pp. 257-80; 1743, *NS*, 1953, pp. 327-39; 1996, J. Bieri, *Sprache der franz. Reklame* (Zurich, 1952). Some other additions for various authors and problems: Balzac: J. M. Burton, *Balzac and his Figures of Speech* (Princeton, 1921); Buffon: Ch. Bruneau, "Buffon et le problème de la forme," *Œuvres philos. de B.*, p. 491-97; Flaubert: P. Biswanger, *Die ästhetische Problematik Flauberts* (Frankfurt, 1934); Gide: W. Schulz, *Die Sprachkunst Gides* (Marburg, 1929); Hugo: A. Joussain, *Le pittoresque dans le lyrisme et l'épopée de H.* (Paris, 1915); Proust: Le Bidois, "Langage parlé des personnages de P.," *FM*, 1939, pp. 197 ff.; Brée, "Style dans *Les Plaisirs et les jours*," *FR*, 1942, pp. 401 ff.; Ullmann, "Transposition of Sensations in P.'s Imagery," *FS*, 1954, pp. 28 ff.; Rousseau: E. Schütte, *Rousseau: seine Persönlichkeit und sein Stil* (Leipzig, 1910); style and rhetorics: I. Söter, *Doctrin stylistique des rhétoriques du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Budapest, 1937); word order: W. Doroszewski, in *Donum natalicium Schrijnen* (1929), pp. 97-101; style in translations: G. Gougenheim, "Traducteurs du Premier Empire," *RPh*, 1947, pp. 143 ff.; style and language: W. T. Elwert, "Valutazione stilistica dell'elemento provenzale nel linguaggio della scuola poetica siciliana," *Hom. a Fritz Kruger*, II, 85-112; J. F. Angelloz, "Statistique et littérature," *MF*, 1952, pp. 291 ff.; A. Niederstenbruch, "Stil der franz. Sprache," *NM*, 1942, pp. 150 ff.; Ch. A. Séchehayé, "Stylistique et linguistique théorique," *Mélanges De Saussure* (1908), pp. 155-87. In 1976 read Hans Adank, not Frank. (MICHAEL RIFFATERRE, *Columbia University*)

*Romanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Von Dr. Heinrich Lausberg. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1956. Vol. I: *Einleitung und Vokalismus*. Pp. 159. Vol. II: *Konsonantismus*. Pp. 95. Ever since the appearance of his important study of the dialect of Southern Lucania (*Die Mundart Südlukaniens* [Halle, 1939]), which was one of the early examples of the introduction of structural thinking to Romance studies, Professor Lausberg has been one of the most active and most modern of the present day German Romanists. He was the ideal choice for the authorship of the two volumes on Romance phonology which are to replace A. Zauner's *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft* in the *Göschens* series (now taken over and continued by Walter de Gruyter and Co.). Lausberg's undertaking—namely to bring Zauner, Meyer-Lübke, Bourciez, etc. up-to-date and to replace them by a modern work is by far more ambitious and important than is indicated by the modest format of the two volumes.

Lausberg's work touches, of course, on practically all the disputed points of historical Romance phonology and presents quite definitely always his own point of view—often without mentioning opposing theories—a practice which is perhaps somewhat questionable in a student manual. While I find myself quite often in complete agreement with Lausberg, it is nevertheless a bit surprising to see opposing points of view (like Germanic influence in the lengthening of free vowels in France, Celtic influence in the change *u* > *y*, Etruscan influence in the "gorgia toscana") either unmentioned or brushed aside as of negligible importance.

With regard to certain fundamental problems, Lausberg takes rather traditional attitudes: the division between East and West Romance goes back to the second century; Merovingian Latin (contrary to the Muller hypothesis) is an artificial written Latin interdispersed with vulgarisms; the Romance languages owe their particular features to a mixture of factors, among which are the time and manner of colonization, and sub- and super-strata.

Perhaps the most characteristic feature of Lausberg's approach, however, is that in actual practice he minimizes the sub- and super-stratum theory and tries to explain features usually explained by that theory as particular manifestations of common Romance features, potentially present in Latin and thus in all of the Romania. Thus (I, 102) he attempts to link the lengthening of free vowels in Northern France and Northern Italy directly to the existence of phonemic vowel quantity in Latin, basing himself primarily on the argument that in a word like *stella* > *étoile* the vowel develops like a free vowel (preserving the Latin length?), while in a word like *cōllum* > *col*, the *o* develops like a short vowel. The "gorgia toscana" (II, 95) is connected with a general trend toward relaxed occlusion in intervocalic position in the sentence, (thus *\*la parte* but *\*las partes*), a trend which supposedly existed even throughout Western Romance, where, however, the word initial relaxed pronunciation was eventually given up in favor of the post-consonantal allophone. The fall of *-s* in Eastern Romance is generally preceded by a shift of *-s* > *i* (still preserved in monosyllabic words) which can also be observed in Provençal and Gascon (II, 81).

Another outstanding feature of Lausberg's book is the rather large section devoted to general phonetics and phonemics. Phonetics is presented exclusively as motory phonetics, since acoustic phonetics have by and large not yet been applied to the solution of specific Romance problems. Lausberg himself gives, however, a presentation of the theory of the syllable which is based primarily on acoustic phonetic considerations (I, 40 ff.): the syllable is defined as a segment of speech containing a minimal and maximal point of acoustic power. The section on phonemics gives a good account of the notion of language as a structural system which tends toward symmetry.

A last word on Lausberg's application of structuralism in his presentation: his historical structuralism is a descriptive kind of structural presentation. It lacks the dynamism found in Juillard's and Haudricourt's *Essai pour une histoire structurale du phonétisme français* (Paris, 1949), or in Martinet's *L'Economie des changements phonétiques* (Bern, 1956). Thus Lausberg presents structurally the basic vowel systems of the Romania, but does not assign to the monophthongization of the diphthongs any role in shaping the systems; nor does he ever connect the Western Romance simplification of geminates and the voicing of unvoiced intervocalic stops as part of a dynamic chain reaction. What is even more disappointing is that Lausberg—while himself elaborating the notion of structure—applies structural presentation practically only to the basic vowel systems. All of the vowel developments within Romance and all of the consonantism is presented in good old-fashioned "atomistic" fashion: initial *p-* in French, initial *p-* in Italian, in Spanish, etc. Perhaps such a type of presentation is necessary in an introductory manual, yet I cannot but wonder whether even elementary students of Romance phonology could not become more absorbed in this subject if it were presented to them as a dynamic sequence of structural developments rather than an accumulation of apparently disconnected facts. The real excuse for Lausberg's presentation is perhaps that it reflects well the present unfinished state of the application of structural linguistics to historical Romance phonology.

*In fine*, aside from some shortcomings which are perhaps those of the state of our discipline rather than those of the author, Professor Lausberg is to be thanked and congratulated for having given us an accurate, up-to-date manual of historical Romance phonology. (ROBERT L. POLITZER, *University of Michigan*)



*Der lexikalische Einfluss des Deutschen im Spiegel der französischen Presse zur Zeit des zweiten Weltkrieges.* Von Victor Riederer. (Romanica Helvetica, 56). Berne: A. Francke, 1955. Pp. 201. Among his purposes, the author states, is "the examination of the attitude of one language toward another one which penetrates by violence;—the connection between the reaction of Frenchmen to this penetration, and linguistic changes;—the predominant rôle of emotion and of consciousness" (p. 15). "This study," he adds, "is not to be an inventory of loanwords or foreign words, but at most a selection of such words which almost became loanwords or could have become such." With this limitation in mind the usefulness of the book cannot be denied.

A linguistic investigation of this kind may illuminate many aspects of a short historical period. Political, sociological as well as psychological elements have their share in the formation of new words in times of stress. Here, admittedly, military and political terms constitute the bulk of the study, insofar as German expressions have called forth borrowings in the French language. The author recognizes the reservations that a study like his must provoke. The press, he states, does not reflect anything like all the expressions which developed out of the abnormal situation resulting from the occupation of France by German soldiers. Yet, he wanted to find the printed confirmation of certain usages, occurring during the war years, in both the official and the clandestine French press.

Whereas the purely linguistic yield may appear slim, the psychological impact of the stress and pressure during the German occupation comes out with remarkable clarity. Riederer has furnished a concise, most felicitous outline of German and French history since 1918 to serve as background to his study. Throughout, he has evoked in sober but by no means indifferent or insensitive terms the atmosphere of the war years. He has grasped very clearly the degree of usage of each of the words he examines, be it in their factual adoption, their often ironical use, or their grim implications to both occupant and resistant.

In concluding Riederer refrains from claiming any definitive absorption of any of the words borrowed under such exceptional conditions, in one form or another, from German. Quite rightly he reminds us of recurrences in linguistic influence, of temporary shifts, of transpositions of meaning, in short, of the passing fashion and subsequent loss of words imposed by outward circumstances.

The intensity shown in the temporary adoption of purely German words by the French is a significant phenomenon and evidences either the longevity of a handful of such wartime borrowings or the immunity of the French language against the massive use of words artificially grafted on it by way of an all-powerful press and radio. The author gives sociological reasons for the widely differentiated reception or usage of terms frequently found in newspapers. He makes an excellent distinction between dictated newspaper propaganda and spontaneous creation of words which were eventually accepted by the press. He also notes that certain widely understood German words never appeared in print. He stresses the necessity of studying the spoken language to measure the real influence of German on French—an endeavor that would go beyond the scope of his book.

As one of the results of his study, Riederer proclaims that the adopted German expression either appears as an intruder or is considered a model worth following, while its French translation is only a substitute or a new formation. This brings up the question to what extent French could maintain its independence toward

the "occupying" tongue, despite its political subjection. Without historical evaluation one could determine France's spiritual attitude during the war from the behavior of its language toward the foreign one. This attitude is characterized by a strong consciousness of its mission to oppose the intruder with all its might and its vitality. And where French does adopt German elements, it imprints its own seal on these words.

It might be said, in comparison, that the stationing of American troops in France, after the war, has produced a mass of spontaneously chosen new creations in the French language, many of which are already sanctioned by dictionaries.

Now the vast majority of the words studied by Riederer are of a type that normally would defy adoption or assimilation. They are used in their exotic consonance, and the author points out correctly the concern for precision that goes with the frequent juxtaposition of a German word and a French word, e.g. German "Panzer" with French "blindé" which does not cover quite the same area, or the intrinsic ironical value of "Kultur," a word already in disrepute after World War I. Considerable space is given to speculations on the reasons for the widely varying spelling of German words used by the French.

At one point only is there a serious factual error in this otherwise thoroughly well documented book: Hitler did not come to power through the Munich "Putsch" of 1923 as stated (p. 85); the "Putsch" collapsed and Hitler was sentenced to a prison term in a fortress.

The nature of the study makes a number of repetitions inevitable. Among the minor errors should be listed the missing of the frequently printed expression "pétiniste"; the opinion that "collaborationniste" was more frequent than "collaborateur"; omission of a number of phonetic transcriptions of German words such as "osvèce" for "Ausweis"; a number of misprints unusual in books published by Francke and particularly disturbing in a book which necessarily reproduces some of the many historical misspellings of German by Frenchmen; the tracing of certain words, e.g. "paratroupes" to German instead of English; the listing of "apatride" among words created during the war, whereas it existed well before; the unexplained, baffling note "pro-German" after the Resistance paper *Bir Hakeim*; etc. (KONRAD BIEBER, *Connecticut College*)

*La Convergence stylistique chez Proust.* Par Yvette Louria. Genève: Librairie Droz; Paris: Librairie Minard, 1957. Pp. 100. The title of this latest contribution to the study of Proust's style is perhaps a little frightening at first, but its choice was entirely logical and the book need not present any difficulties to the non-specialist.

Mrs. Louria distinguishes convergence from enumeration and parallelism by defining it as "un ensemble d'éléments, composés chacun d'un morphème ou d'un syntagme, et exerçant tous la même fonction grammaticale par rapport à un 'pivot' commun, autre morphème ou syntagme. En d'autres termes, la convergence est comparable à un ensemble de tableaux (les éléments), dont chacun représente une idée, et qui sont tous reliés à un autre tableau (le pivot), de la même façon. Les éléments sont, par exemple, tous prédicats d'un même sujet, ou tous sujets d'un même prédicat,—ou bien encore, ils modifient tous le même nom" (p. 9).

This same lucidity of expression characterizes the whole study. Mrs. Louria never abuses technical terminology, though one might have wished that she had

included with her list of abbreviations a lexicon of those figures of speech which are defined implicitly in a manner slightly different from the common dictionary definition, e.g. polysyndeton (p. 29), anaphora (p. 31). She refers the reader however to J. Marouzeau's *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique* where these terms are clearly and simply explained along with the others that are basic to her study—anacoluthon, syllepsis, ellipsis, syntagma, etc.

Following her first chapter, in which she gives examples of various types of convergence based on grammatical function, Mrs. Louria goes on to examine successively stylistic effect, combinations of convergences and the profound significance of the use of convergence in the novel as a whole. She concludes with a comparison of this aspect of Proust's style and the same device in other writers' works.

All recent critics on Proust's style have had to begin with Jean Mouton's pioneer study *Le Style de Marcel Proust* (Editions Corrêa, 1948). In this work, examples are not chosen systematically and they are unfortunately restricted to *Du côté de chez Swann* even though the comments on them are intuitively sound. M. Mouton considers the question of convergence (pp. 145-72) incidentally in his chapter on enumeration (though he is far from isolating and defining the device). What Mrs. Louria has done is to make a careful statistical analysis of the whole of *A la recherche du temps perdu* based on the fifteen-volume edition of the N.R.F. (1948). Her conclusions are therefore not just impressions; they are forced on her by the facts.

Only in the chapter where she compares Proust to other writers does Mrs. Louria depart from the principle of statistical examination. Having criticized Jean Mouton because "ses recherches semblent s'appuyer uniquement sur des exemples choisis, et non pas sur une analyse systématique" (p. 4), she then turns around and chooses her examples "d'une anthologie quelconque d'écrivains contemporains de Proust" (p. 77), adding to them passages chosen at random where other authors (not necessarily contemporary) have treated themes similar to those found in Proust. Mrs. Louria assures us that it was not her intention to try to show that "Proust aurait réussi là où les autres auraient échoué" (p. 77), but the general effect is to make Proust appear by contrast much superior to any of the other authors quoted. No lover of *A la recherche du temps perdu* is going to take her to task for this, but is it true? Is one even justified in concluding from this type of analysis that convergence is a device inherent in Proust's style and not to be found to the same extent in any other author?

The most interesting chapter of the book in fact is the one on the profound significance of convergence in Proust. Mrs. Louria relates this stylistic device to Proust's attempt to transcend the crystallization of words by coming at the same fact from different angles. "Ce qu'exprime une convergence, c'est ainsi en quelque sorte, à l'occasion d'un détail précis, la réalité complexe qu'a voulu peindre Proust, dans toute son œuvre" (p. 62).

The book is meticulous in detail, logical and scholarly. It is a valuable contribution to the definitive study of Proust's style which still remains to be written. But in itself it makes fascinating reading for any student of Proust, for it focusses our attention on a facet of his technique which most of us had perceived but dimly. It makes us recall again the truth of Proust's own statement (*TR*, II, 70) which can serve as a tribute to Mrs. Louria's study: "L'ouvrage d'un écrivain n'est qu'une espèce d'instrument d'optique qu'il offre au lecteur pour lui permettre

de discerner ce que sans ce livre il n'eût peut-être pas vu en soi-même." (VICTOR E. GRAHAM, *University of Alberta*)

*Poésie et mystique: Paul Claudel, poète chrétien.* Par H. J. W. Van Hoorn, O.F.M. Genève: Droz; Paris: Minard, 1957. Pp. 159. Father van Hoorn's book has a double intent. Its subtitle indicates that Claudel's work is the subject of his study; the analysis of his doctrine as explained and defined in *Art poétique* and as realized in one of the *Cinq Grandes Odes*. But the whole first half of the book is a study of the nature and problems of the creative act in art in its relationship and comparison with the "acte religieux." This definition, so often skirted and more often ill-characterized, is not really to be found here, or anywhere else for that matter. But there is an honest attempt to reduce the area of the question to that surrounding the integration, within his life and work, between a man's aspirations, spiritual and deo-centric on the one hand, which may be called personal, and, on the other, his esthetic and communicative or social aims.

This very problem was at the core of Claudel's fears at the turn of the century when his conversion seemed to entail the sacrifice of his art to a purely spiritual vocation.

Father van Hoorn begins with a two-fold study; the first is the nature of the poetic act. Here he proceeds largely by elimination. The poetic act is not the "tranche créative" of Valéry since the inspired moment merely leads to the "explication"; the poet who is inspired but who does not produce an intelligible and effective poem is no poet. (The questions of obscurity, automatic writing, and the opposition of traditional and nontraditional forms are mentioned, but not elaborated). Here the main drawbacks are a tendency to generalize, the inevitability of platitudes, and the rapid contrast or integration of poets like Rimbaud, Nerval, Baudelaire and Rilke. The author's conclusion makes poetry a new sympathy with the objective world demanding expression in communicable form; the poem is the endless renewal of man's unity with the universe in the conscious (non-primitive and adult) imposition of form and mastery of life. As Mallarmé knew, the poem can never be written.

The author's discussion of the religious act makes a useful distinction among the acts or attitudes of faith, or belief beyond reason, of religion, which may be non-Christian, and of religiosity or the pseudo-religious. Thus, both Rimbaud and Rilke are fundamentally religious poets seeking to restore the Edenic unity between man and his world, while Saint John of the Cross, obviously a religious poet, simply adds to his poetry the qualities of mystical knowledge which come as a by-product of experiences uniting him to God. However, Father van Hoorn warns us, this is no guarantee that good poetry will result, for the Muse and the "Ange" are not one. Art is subject to no personal convictions. Baudelaire's "Hymne à la Beauté" illustrates the inescapably affective nature of poetry, the profoundly individual essence of poetic concept and execution. Art is saved by its "neutralité ouverte." It is above the truth or beauty of the man's beliefs and beyond the baseness of a man's character.

Claudel's doctrine is explained with concision, if not clarity, but only a rapid appreciation is given of its general application. Incidentally, while the author denies any Jansenistic tendencies in Claudel's drama, his description of man's struggles in those parables is clearly open to such interpretation. The more im-

portant chapter is that on the "Symbole," the metaphor that escapes time by maintaining its heterogeneous character without losing its primitive attributes. The symbol which is not to become a cliché retains its "real" quality, that is, its adherence to a system of values.

The last and longest chapter, is a full-blown "explication de texte" of the third ode, "La Muse qui est la Grâce." It is clear and accurate in the main, particularly in reference to content, in the appreciation of Claudel's rhythmic genius and of the sea as a constantly recurring symbol. The criticisms of certain images make us regret that no further study of Claudel's imagery was included to evaluate the poet's doctrines and the author's own classification of egocentric and cosmocentric metaphors. We are left with the impression that Fat'er van Hoorn thinks Claudel a successful religious poet, but we are free to question the validity or necessity of religious inspiration as a guarantor of poetic quality despite earlier distinctions. It is indisputable that facile religiosity is the slayer of poetry. Baudelaire, satanic or angelic, Rimbaud, "mystique à l'état sauvage," and Claudel as inspector of the universe must be judged as poets; as poets they endure or fail. The salvation of their souls is for God and their poems shall never be weighed in the same balance. The poetic and religious acts will never be the same, though each may occur within the man. When they do, the poetic act is enriched, but it keeps its independence and freshness. (MARTHE LAVALLÉE WILLIAMS, *Columbus, Ohio*)





## SOUND and POETRY

*Edited with an Introduction by Northrop Frye*

Mr. Frye and the following other critics offer new insights into the complex relationship between meaning and the sound-patterns of poetry: Edward T. Cone, Frederick W. Sternfeld, John Hollander, Craig La Drière, Ants Oras, and Harold Whitehall. *English Institute Essays, 1956.* \$3.75

## SOCIETY and SELF in the NOVEL

*Edited with a Foreword by Mark Schorer*

"Six beautifully written essays dealing with the relation of society to self. . . . Though there is a great deal of individual variety, the authors see the structure of the novel in terms of a tension between private vision and an unsatisfying public truth; it is the task of the novelist both to portray and to resolve this tension."—*The Review of Metaphysics. English Institute Essays, 1955.* \$3.50

## LOUIS JOUVET Man of the Theatre

*By Bettina Liebowitz Knapp*

The first biography in English of Louis Jovet, who as actor, director, and producer is one of the great figures of the modern theatre. Dr. Knapp sensitively coalesces his life and personality, work and achievements, ideas and ideals, as she discusses all aspects of Jovet's diverse talents through the medium of his individual productions. *Illustrated.* \$6.00

## Le STYLE des PLÉIADES de GOBINEAU

ESSAI D'APPLICATION D'UNE METHODE STYLISTIQUE

*By Michael Riffaterre*

Using a new approach to literary criticism, the author shows how Gobineau's philosophy of life and subconscious thoughts are expressed through his style in *Les Pléiades*. A method of stylistic analysis gives Dr. Riffaterre unusual insight into Gobineau's work and supports his conclusion that Gobineau's enduring value lies not in his unfortunate sociological theories but in his originality as a writer. *In French.* \$4.50

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

New York 27, N. Y.

